DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 124 HE 013 608

AUTHOR Konek, Carol W.; And Others
TITLE Design for Equity: Women and Leadership in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Wichita State Univ., Kans.
SPONS AGENCY Women's Educational Equity Act Program (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 158p.; Colored pages may not reproduce clearly.
AVAILABLE FROM Educational Development Center, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, MA 02160.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; *College Administration; *Equal Education; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Feminism; *Higher Education; Leadership; *Sex Discrimination; Social Change
IDENTIFIERS *Project DELTA

ABSTRACT

Twenty-one articles are compiled on the struggle of women for equity in education, including background material, theory, practice, accomplishments, and legislation. Plans, programs, and accomplishments are outlined for Project DELTA, the Women's Educational Equity grant program, which has as its goal the promotion of equity for women in higher education, specifically in leadership and decision-making roles. Research has been focused on aspects of behavioral changes for women: life and career planning, self-assessment of leadership qualities and leadership skills, as well as on institutional policies and goals. Among the topics discussed in this manual are the Women's Educational Equity Act, "sexism in academe," the advancement of women in higher education administration, women's equity as a university priority, the dilemma of the black woman in higher education, and the question of whether the woman changes the system or vice-versa. Addresses and programs from various fields, abstracts of DELTA workshop activities, biographical notes on all participants in the present manual, and a selected bibliography are included. (PJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200124

HE

Project DELTA, Wichita State University

Design for Equity:

Women and Leadership in Higher Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE013608

Women's Educational Equity Act Program
U.S. Education Department

Project DELTA
Wichita State University

Design for Equity:
Women and Leadership in Higher Education

Prepared by
Carol W. Konek
Sally L. Kitch
Geraldine E. Hammond

Women's Educational Equity Act Program
U.S. EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Shirley M. Hufstedler, Secretary

Steven A. Minter, Under Secretary
F. James Rutherford, Assistant Secretary for
Educational Research and Improvement

Discrimination Prohibited: No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

The activity which is the subject of this report was produced under a grant from the U.S. Education Department, under the auspices of the Women's Educational Equity Act. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Printed and distributed by Education Development Center, 1980, 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts 02160.

CONTENTS

Roles Learned by Rote: Access to Higher Education for Women in the Nineteenth Century 1
Carol Wolfe Konek

The Women's Educational Equity Act 11
Annette TenElshof

And What of the Young Women? 15
Geraldine Hammond

The Status of Women in Higher Education: Review Essay 19
Marion Kilson

Academic Administration: The Hard Core of Sexism in Academe 25
Alexander W. Astin

Three's a Crowd: The Dilemma of the Black Woman in Higher Education 33
Constance M. Carroll

Men in Organizations: Some Reflections 43
Herbert A. Shepard

Women and the Structure of Organizations: Explorations in Theory and Behavior 49
Rosabeth Moss Kanter

The Woman or the System: Who Changes Whom? 71
Sally L. Kitch

Toward a Woman-Centered University 77
Adrienne Rich

Men over Forty, Women under Forty 81
Carolyn G. Heilbrun

Survival Dynamics for Women in Educational Administration 85
R. Susan Gordon and *Patricia G. Ball*

Contributions to Practice: Organizational Change, Affirmative Action, and the Quality of Work Life 89
Rosabeth Moss Kanter

Premises for Promoting Equity in Higher Education 109
Carol Wolfe Konek

Project DELTA — A Model for Change 113
Sally L. Kitch

DELTA Workshop Designs 117
Carol Wolfe Konek and *Sally L. Kitch*

Obstacles and Opportunities for Women in Higher Education 125
Sheila Tobias

A View of Equity on Campus 129
Marjorie Bell Chambers

A Decision for Equity: The Advancement of Women in Higher Education Administration 133
Thomas M. Stauffer

Women's Equity as a University Priority 137
Marjorie Downing Wagner

What's Next for Women in Higher Education? 145
Barbara Uehling

Notes on Contributors 155

Selected Bibliography 157

Foreword

We present this manual in the hope that it will furnish you with interesting and valuable information. The manual includes backgrourd on the long struggle toward equity for women in education and on the more recent legislation toward that end; and selected articles of general interest on theory, practice, accomplishments, and hopes for equity—articles which may reveal that gains toward our mutual goals have ranged from none (as a piece originally published in the *AAUP Journal* thirty years ago will reveal), to no observable change, to measurable progress.

The plan, programs, and accomplishments of Project DELTA itself, as an effort toward equity, are outlined here; addresses and programs presented by outstanding persons in their fields have been transcribed for inclusion in these pages, and there are abstracts of DELTA workshop activities, biographical notes on all participants in the manual, and a selected bibliography of important and useful books and articles.

We welcome you to this DESIGN FOR EQUITY workshop with enthusiasm and with the hope that our exchange of ideas, questions, plans, and proposals will prove stimulating and productive. We ourselves are much encouraged by the very fact that such an event as this is taking place and especially that you will be actively participating in it.

Carol Konek
Project Director
Sally Kitch
Development Coordinator
Geraldine Hammond
Administrative Liaison Coordinator
Wichita State University
June, 1978

Roles Learned by Rote: Access to Higher Education for Women in the Nineteenth Century

Carol Wolfe Konek

All the world is a stage, thought I, and few are there in it who do not play the part they have learnt by rote; and those who do not, seem marks to be set up to be pelted by fortune; or rather as sign-posts, which point out the road to others, whilst forced to stand still themselves amidst the mud and dust.

Mary Wollstonecraft, 1795

The nineteenth century demonstrates that the education of women was a cultural imperative in a democratic society. At the beginning of the century, the question of the legitimacy of educating women was hotly debated. By the end of the century, although there was not consensus that women *should* be educated, it had become clear that they *would* be educated. Still, there were unresolved conflicts concerning the roles for which they would be educated. The period saw the rise of a number of diverse institutions dedicated to, or tolerant of, the education of women, but the period did not see the resolution of the conflict between women's intellectual and academic roles and their social and domestic roles. Historically, the education of women has been a radical occurrence. It is therefore not surprising that the serious confrontation with these conflicts did not occur in a democratic society until almost two hundred years after the founding of Harvard. It is not surprising that the conflicts are not yet totally resolved. Because there is every indication that institutions of higher learning are now attempting to achieve educational equality, it is important to look to the past for the sources and the solutions of conflicts which have influenced academic role expectations for women.

THE MYTHICAL MILIEU

The adversaries of higher education for women in the nineteenth century were often chivalrous and only sometimes disparaging in the expression of their motives. They sought to preserve the decorative innocence, the domestic saintliness, and the delicate health of women. Books of advice written by men for women were very popular and undoubtedly had an important influence in socializing women into anti-academic role definitions.

Jonathan F. Stearns reprinted in pamphlet form his sermon called "Female Influence, and the True Christian Mode of Its Exercise," in which he admonished a woman to tend to her province, her home, assuring her that:

...the influence of woman is not limited to the domestic circle. Society is her empire, which she governs almost at will....It is her province to adorn social life, to throw a charm over the intercourse of the world, by making it lovely and attractive, pure and improving.[1]

Daniel Wise, in *The Young Lady's Counselor*, instructs:

Everything has its appointed sphere, within which alone it can flourish. Men and women have theirs. They are not exceptions to this truth, but examples of it. To be happy and prosperous, they must abide in them. Man is fitted for the storms of public life, and, like the petrel, can be happy amidst their rudest surges. Woman is

Copyright © 1978 by Carol Wolfe Konek.

[1]Aileen S. Kraditor, ed. : *Up from the Pedestal* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968), 47; Jonathan F. Stearns: *Female Influence and the True Christian Mode of Its Exercise: A Discourse Delivered in the First Presbyterian Church in Newburyport, July 30, 1837* (Newburyport, Massachusetts, 1837), 8-24.

formed for the calm of the home. She may venture, like the land-bird, to invade the sphere of man; but she will encounter storms which she is utterly unfitted to meet; happiness will forsake her breast, her own sex will despise her, men will be unable to love her, and when she dies she will fill an unhonored grave.[2]

While avoiding public life or her own education, she achieved her power, or at least her satisfaction, vicariously by educating and inspiring her sons and husband:

Nor are the pleasures of success less delightful in a woman's breast because she attains through another. If a rich rise of joy flows through the breast of an applauded hero, a triumphant statesman, or a useful philanthropist, there is another equally delightful in the bosom of the woman who is conscious that, but for her, the great man would never have mounted the pedestal to his greatness.[3]

Woman's only sanctioned public mission was a saintly one, as revealed by this excerpt from a "Pastoral Letter of the Massachusetts Congregational Clergy" in response to Sarah and Angelina Grimké's public speeches on abolition in 1837:

The power of woman is in her dependence, flowing from the consciousness of that weakness which God had given her for her protection, and which keeps her in those departments of life that form the character of individuals and of the nation. There are social influences which females use in promoting piety and the great objects of Christian benevolence which we cannot too highly commend. We appreciate the unostentatious efforts of women in advancing the cause of religion at home and abroad; in leading Sabbath-schools; in leading religious inquirers to the pastors for instruction; and in all such associated effort as becomes the modesty of her sex; and earnestly hope that she may abound more and more in these labors of piety and love. But when she assumes the place and tone of man as a public reformer, our care and protection of her seem unnecessary; we put ourselves in self-defence against her; she yields the power which God has given her for her protection, and her character becomes unnatural. If the vine, whose strength and beauty is to lean upon the trellis work and half conceal its clusters, thinks to assume the independence and the overshadowing nature of the elm, it will not only cease to bear fruit, but fall in shame and dishonor into the dust.[4]

Education of the wrong sort would not merely unsex a woman, it would cause serious physical disabilities, as Dr. Edward Clarke, professor of medicine at Harvard, warned in 1873 in his book, *Sex in Education*. He blamed education for "the thousand ills" and "grievous maladies" that beset American women and "tortured their earthly existence."[5] Not only *men* believed that women would suffer strange debilities as the result of education. Even in the writings of Margaret Fuller, an advocate of education of women, we find the complaint that her father's efforts to educate her as an equal resulted in physical symptoms: "...there was finally produced a state of being both too active and too intense, which wasted my constitution, and will bring me...to a premature grave."[6]

Educators of the time were often more concerned with defining the limits of social roles for women than with exploring the potential for learning that women might have. Education all too often reinforced restrictive socialization and prescribed appropriate conduct rather than generating intellectual curiosity. Mrs. Almira Phelps, the well-known educator, explained:

---

[2]Daniel Wise: *The Young Lady's Counselor* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1951), 96.
[3]Ibid., 98.
[4]Aileen S. Kraditor, ed.: *Up from the Pedestal* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968), 51; "Pastoral Letter of the General Association of Massachusetts (Orthodox) to the Churches under Their Care," *The Liberator* (Boston, August 11, 1837).
[5]Edward H. Clarke: *Sex in Education* (Bostor: James R. Osgood and Company, 1873), 22.
[6]Barbara M. Cross: *The Educated Woman in America* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1965); Margaret Fuller Ossoli: *Memoirs of Margaret Fuller Ossoli* (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and Co., 1952), 1, 14-16.

The object in all attempted improvements in female education should not be to lead woman from her own proper sphere, but to qualify her for the better discharge of those duties which lie within it. It is for you to prove by meek and gentle manners, by your pious walk and conversation, that the daughters of Eve may eat at the tree of knowledge, without danger of sin.[7]

The nineteenth-century woman in America was, by popular definition, a household saint. She was expected to be the embodiment of all that was nurturing and pure in a violent and untamed country in the process of founding itself upon principles of equality and self-reliance. She had learned the lesson of courageous exploration in her emigration to these strange shores; she had learned from a revolution what was later to become the basis for a tradition of dissent; she had watched education emerge as one of the most vital values in a country establishing its national priorities. The importance of her role as the educator of the young was being impressed upon her: it was the role of molder of the character of future leaders of the country. She was to produce an educated electorate. Yet she was to think of herself as intellectually limited, as more spiritual than intellectual, as too gentle for public strife, as too fragile for the rigors of learning. Role expectations as they were embodied in the mythologies of the day were already in conflict with social forces which would make her entrance into higher education a cultural imperative. She could not be entrusted with the education of the young without educating herself. She could not educate herself for this purpose and be content with a little learning. It was inevitable that she would gain access to higher education.

THE DOORSTEP OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In 1684, when the question of admitting girls to the Hopkins School of New Haven had arisen, it had been declared that "all girls be excluded as improper and inconsistent with such a grammar school as ye law enjoins in the Designs of this settlement."[8] Yet a Professor Thomas reported that certain small girls whose manners had been neglected and had the natural curiosity of their sex sat on the schoolhouse step and listened to their brothers recite.[9] In Newburyport, Massachusetts, near the turn of the eighteenth century, the Town Council had ordained that during the dull summer session, after the schoolmaster had finished instructing the boys, he could give the girls an hour and a half of instruction.[10] By 1789, when Boston established its public school system, girls were allowed to attend from April to October, undoubtedly because these were the months when the boys were absent to meet the demands of work. As girls were sporadically admitted to public schools and as their education kept pace with that of their brothers through evening tutorial sessions held by candlelight, girls gained in literacy so that by the first third of the nineteenth century there was probably as much literacy among women as among men.[11] Ironically, women were teaching in the Dames Schools before any concentrated effort had been made to regulate the quality of their education, although academies had sprung up which occasionally admitted girls, and a few seminaries had been established, beginning with the first female seminary in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, founded in 1749.

---

[7]Robert E. Riegel: *American Women: A Story of Social Change* (Madison, Wisconsin: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1970); Mrs. Almira Phelps: *The Female Student* (New York: Leavitt, Lord & Co., 1836), 321.

[8]Eugene A. Hecker: *History of Women's Rights in the United States* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1914), 1968.

[9]Inez Haynes Irwin: *Angels and Amazons: A Hundred Years of American Women* (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1933), 23.

[10]Eugene A. Hecker: *History of Women's Rights in the United States* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1914), 169.

[11]Irwin, op. cit., 23.

The increase in female seminaries and academies, high schools, and normal schools coincided with a new examination of the emulation of the English educational model. An avid supporter of women's education and an advocate of functional education declared:

> It is high time to awake from this servility — to study our own character — to examine the age of our country — and to adopt manners in every thing that shall be accommodated to our state of society, and to the forms of our government. In particular it is incumbent upon us to make ornamental accomplishments yield to principles and knowledge in the education of our women.[12]

The seminaries were to function as a synthesizing force in helping young women begin to resolve some of the role conflicts imposed upon them by society. Before the establishment of Emma Willard's school for girls in Troy, New York, in 1819, much of what had passed for education for young women had been training in "accomplishments." Emma Willard was one of the first pioneers in women's education to formulate and devote her life to practicing a carefully detailed philosophy of women's education. She based her philosophy on two principles: studies must be selected either because they "improve the faculties" or "that they may be useful for future life."[13] She designed a curriculum which included: 1. religious and moral training; 2. literary study; 3. domestic instruction (in practice as well as in theory); and 4. ornamental instruction, such as drawing, painting, elegant penmanship, and music and the grace of motion.

Although it cannot be argued that Emma Willard sought to prepare her students for non-traditional roles, and although she was opposed to higher education for women, she was the first person to succeed in calling public attention to the special educational needs of women and to define an attitude toward the education of women which would later be reflected in the goals of women's colleges. In the *Plan for Improving Female Education* which she presented before the New York Legislature in 1819, she asked support for a system of education which would cultivate reason, would teach systems of morality, would develop a taste for moral and intellectual pleasures which would elevate women above a passion for show and parade, and would be philosophically enlightening.[14]

Catharine Beecher established the Hartford Female Seminary in 1832. In her *Suggestions Respecting Improvements in Education* to the trustees, she stated:

> It is to mothers, and to teachers, that the world is to look for the character which is to be enstamped on each succeeding generation, for it is to them that the business of education is almost exclusively committed.[15]

In pleading for the improvement of the education of teachers, and in pointing out the consistencies between the roles of mother and teacher, Catharine Beecher was legitimizing education for women's roles in the traditional sense, while making inroads into the educational system for women. She expanded on this theme when she published her book, *Domestic Economy*, which at once reinforced woman's idea of her traditional role and at the same time gave birth to "domestic science" as a field of study and professional training.

---

[12]Thomas Woody: *A History of Women's Education in the United States* (New York: The Science Press, 1929), 1, 303.

[13]Ibid., 309.

[14]Willystine Goodsell, ed.: *Pioneers of Women's Education in the United States* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931), 60-5; Emma Willard: *Plan for Improving Female Education* (New York, 1819).

[15]Goodsell, op. cit., 146; Catharine Beecher: *Suggestions Respecting Improvements in Education Presented to the Trustees of the Hartford Female Seminary* (Hartford: Packard & Butler, 1829).

Mary Lyon, who founded Mt. Holyoke Female Seminary in 1836, expressed her ideas on standards of excellence in women's education in 1836 thus:

> The grand features of this Institution are to be an elevated standard of science, literature, and refinement, and a moderate standard of expense; all to be guided and modified by the spirit of the gospel....We doubt not that the atmosphere will be rendered uncongenial to those who are wrapped up in self, preparing simply to please, and to be pleased, whose highest ambition is to be qualified to amuse a friend in a vacant hour.[16]

Her plan of study included Grammar, Arithmetic, Algebra, Geometry, Modern and Ancient Geography, Government of the United States, Modern and Ancient History, Botany, Natural Philosophy, Intellectual Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Philosophy of Natural History, Natural Theology, and Evidences of Christianity.

While there were academies which emphasized "accomplishments" to the exclusion of academic content, and while there were normal schools which prepared teachers to perpetuate the prescriptive and often shallow teaching of rote skills, these seminaries were formulating curricular plans and theories of education for women which would pave the way for women into higher education. The rise of the female seminaries was important in upgrading standards, in gaining public acceptance for the education of women in roles of service, and in setting the precedent of government funding for the education of women. Although the seminaries were regarded by most as a substitute for higher education for women, it is questionable that the progress women made in gaining access to true institutions of higher education could have been made without the pioneering efforts of the women who made the seminaries educationally respectable.

THE SISTER COLLEGES

Women's colleges and coeducational institutions experienced a gradual emergence before the Civil War. The Wesleyan Female College was founded in 1836, Mary Sharp College for Women in 1852, and Elmira Female College in 1853, to name a few. None of these colleges approached the academic standards of the prestigious institutions for men, however, and during this time repeated efforts were made to secure the admission of women to existing Eastern centers of higher learning, such as Harvard, Columbia, and Johns Hopkins. These efforts were in every case sternly resisted. What was finally worked out was something like the compromise then emerging in the great English universities, namely, coordinate colleges for women affiliated with colleges or universities for men.[17] In 1874, a "Harvard Annex" offered courses with the Harvard faculty to women, and in 1879, that annex became Radcliffe. Barnard College became affiliated with Columbia in 1889, Sophie Newcomb Memorial College with Tulane University in 1886, and Pembroke with Brown University in 1891.

In his first address to the trustees of Vassar College, Matthew Vassar explained his commitment to the establishment of an institution offering quality higher education to women:

> It occurred to me that woman, having received from her creator the same intellectual constitution as man, has the same right as man to intellectual culture and development.[18]

---

[16]Goodsell, op. cit., 263; Mary Lyon: *Mount Holyoke Female Seminary* (Mount Holyoke, 1835).

[17]Ronald W. Hogeland: "The Female Appendage: Feminine Life Styles in America, 1820-1860," *Civil War History*, 17, 2, June 1971, 111.

[18]Mabel Newcomer: *A Century of Higher Education for Women* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1959), 1.

He intended that Vassar would "accomplish for young women what colleges of the first class accomplish for young men; that is, to furnish them the means of a thorough, well-proportioned, and liberal education, but one adapted to their wants in life."[19] Although some concessions were made to women's special sphere in the beginning, the main advantage envisioned in the establishment of the college was in its residential character rather than in a curriculum differing from that of the men.[20]

John H. Raymond, the first president of Vassar, outlined his curricular plan and objectives in a prospectus presented to the trustees:

> *First, physical education* is fundamental and peculiarly important to women, though sadly neglected among educated American women. The College will provide rooms, food, hours of study and recreation under careful sanitary regulation....*Second, the intellectual training* will be liberal, for women, a regular course, for four years. While the ordinary college curriculum will furnish a guide for the essentially similar intellectual faculties of girls, constitutional differences, intellectual and moral, will be kept in view....The required studies will be those of universal importance....The regular branches will be English, Latin, French or German, algebra, geometry, natural philosophy, botany, zoology, mineralogy, physical geography, anatomy and physiology and hygiene, outlines of history, theoretic and practical ethics....*Third, moral and religious education* has the "foremost place."...*Fourth, domestic education*....Trustees are satisfied that a full course cannot be successfully incorporated into a liberal education. But the college has responsibilities to teach a correct theory of household management....*Fifth, social education*. It is "hers to refine, illumine, purify, adorn." The methods of social training will be womanly. No encouragement, therefore, would be given to oratory and debate....*Sixth, professional education*....There might be courses of lectures on teaching, but examples of good teaching were assured in the instructors. ... Bookkeeping would claim attention for its general principles.[21]

Although concessions are made for the social sphere of women in this document, they are subordinated to what emerged as the major priority, not only at Vassar, but at the other sister colleges — concentration upon a liberal arts curriculum.

The sister colleges adopted from their beginnings a special mission from which they were only much later and very reluctantly to deviate. If it was true that they were to show a marked tendency to follow rather slavishly the programs of men's colleges and to prove that women's minds were identical to men's,[22] perhaps it was because they were intent on contradicting the system of myths which had been perpetuated concerning women's intellectual inferiority.

In choosing to emulate their brother institutions' academic goals, Vassar and the other sister colleges were rejecting the emphasis on educational socialization which had occurred both at earlier women's colleges and at many of the seminaries and academies. They were intent to instill in women students a love of learning and to afford them an opportunity to demonstrate their intellectual abilities. Because of the resulting dedication to liberal education, women's colleges were to be among the most adamant of resisters to the vocational movement in higher education.

Ironically, in resisting the growth of professionalism and the filtering of

---

[19]Ibid., 55.
[20]Ibid., 55.
[21]James Monroe Taylor: *Before Vassar Opened* (New York: Books for Libraries, 1972), 264.
[22]John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy: *Higher Education in Transition* (New York: 1958), 69.

vocationalism into professionalism, these women's colleges chose to emulate a male model of education which was soon to lose some of its supremacy in higher education. As the elective system, the increasing industrialization of society, the Morrill Act, and other "liberalizing" trends affected higher education, liberal education would increasingly be accused, unjustly for the most part, of being an area of study for dilettantes,[23] and some critics would blame liberal education for keeping women from advancing into non-traditional vocations and professions.

Despite these implications, the women's colleges did a great deal to resolve role conflicts which existed during the nineteenth century. In a time when women writers and intellectuals were ridiculed and labeled "bluestockings," these institutions made scholarship respectable for women, justifying their claim that students need not see womanhood and scholarship as opposites.

COEDUCATION

When Oberlin College opened its doors in 1837, it opened them to everyone and was the first institution of higher education to undertake the joint education of the sexes. Critics who enjoy the benefit of hindsight have belittled the impact of this historical event by claiming that "although the idea of the joint education of the sexes appears to be for the benefit of both parties equally, upon closer inspection one realizes that the education of young ladies was at best only a secondary aim of the school,"[24] and that "the new college offered a much diluted and abridged 'ladies' course' to young women as an alternative to the more advanced course leading to a degree [with the result that] many fair students appear to have preferred the less strenuous path to learning."[25] Indeed, Oberlin did offer special courses for its first women students — courses which more nearly resembled the seminary courses of the time, which stressed "accomplishments" or "feminine arts." There were no models upon which to base an open admissions policy for women who had not been socialized to aspire to academic achievement. Only four young women students enrolled that first year, and much has been made of the fact that the women who did so received a different education from that of their male counterparts. If one takes a broader historical view, it is possible to look beyond the impact of education on these few women and to see the larger issue — that of the role expectations which were altered by this event.

An alumnus of 1864 reports on the conflict the presence of women created in the institution:

> The feeling of hostility was exceedingly intense and bitter. As I now recollect the entire body of students were without exception opposed to the admission of the young ladies, and the anathemas heaped upon the regents were loud and deep. Some of the students left for other colleges, and more of us were restrained only by impecuniosity from following their example. During the remaining year of my own college life, the feeling of intense and bitter indignation caused by the change continued almost unabated.[26]

Yet his view of the situation is contradictory to the view expressed by President Fairchild, who declared the experiment a success, claiming that the women's presence did not prove a check on the men's progress, that

---

[23]Frederick Rudolph: *The American College and University* (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), 324.

[24]Hogeland, op. cit., 111.

[25]Willystine Goodsell: *The Education of Women* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1924), 24.

[26]Anne Firor Scott, ed.: *The American Woman: Who Was She?* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), 64.

women's health did not break down as had been prophesied, and that the discipline problem was decreased as the commingling of the sexes "made young men of boys and gentlemen of rowdies."[27] This defense of the commingling of the sexes in an institutional setting was to be echoed by advocates of coeducation for more than a century. Those who chose to defend coeducation would often justify their choice by praising the civilizing effect of women on the college campus, by declaring that intellectual standards did not have to crumble, and by pointing out that coeducation could become the basis of shared intellectual interests between the sexes.

Coeducation emerged as a gradual process, the result of a number of social forces sometimes independent of motives to create special educational programs to meet the needs of women students. Although one source of the occurrence was ideological, the major impetus for women's higher education came in the second half of the nineteenth century, a time of dire economic need for many colleges, caused chiefly by the shrinking enrollments of males. The sag in college enrollments was attributed to the Civil War, to economic depressions, and to dissatisfaction with college curricula.[28] Even before the Civil War, a new pattern of educational expectations was emerging in the West. The West was just emerging from its pioneer period when women actually fought Indians, ran ranches, worked side by side with their men in founding and regulating the institutions of suddenly born communities. Along the western march, the pioneers had shed many of the old social taboos, so that women were often admitted to the new state universities with men without question.[29] Additionally, women were gaining in economic independence, and the religious doctrine which declared that man was the head and woman the body within marriage was losing its force.[30]

Immediately after the Civil War, the number of colleges admitting women as undergraduates almost doubled,[31] so that by the early twentieth century all state universities, with the exception of Virginia, Georgia, and Louisiana, admitted women.[32] In 1902, 25% of the undergraduates, 26% of the graduate students, and 3% of the professional students in America were women.[33] These figures indicate the tremendous rapidity with which women had gained access to higher education; yet the old role conflicts were not yet resolved, for many women tended to see college as an end in itself, and did not acquire the same aspirations for graduate and professional studies as their male counterparts.[34]

Margaret Fuller, in commenting upon the attainment of equality in education achieved by women in the nineteenth century, observed that:

> Women are now taught, at school, all that men are; they run over, superficially, even more studies, without being really taught anything. When they come to the business of life, they find themselves inferior, and all their studies have not given them that practical good sense, and mother wisdom and wit, which grew up with our grandmothers at the spinning wheel. But, with this difference: men are called on, from a very early period, to reproduce all that they learn. Their college exercises, their political duties, their professional studies, the first actions of life

---

[27]Robert Fletcher: *History of Oberlin College* (Oberlin: Oberlin College, 1943), 1, 383.

[28]Constantina Safilios Rothschild, ed.: *Toward a Sociology of Women* (Lexington, Massachusetts, 1973); Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Women in Academe," 34.

[29]Irwin, op. cit., 123.

[30]Woody, op. cit., 11, 260.

[31]Nancy Frazier and Myra Sadher: *Sexism in School and Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), 261.

[32]Brubacher and Rudy, op. cit., 69.

[33]Edith Hoshino Altbach: *Women in America* (Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1974), 180.

[34]Betty Friedan: *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1963), 347.

in any direction, call on them to put to use what they have learned. But women learn without any attempt to reproduce. Their only reproduction is for purposes of display.[35]

But women who wanted to "reproduce what they learned" in active service *had* made gains throughout the nineteenth century and had distinguished themselves scholastically, made inroads into professions which did little to encourage the admission of women. Yet there were greater gains to be made before the American woman could synthesize her academic and professional roles and her domestic and social roles and experience herself as an autonomous, contributing individual. A few pioneers had been admitted into medicine, the bar, and the ministry; yet there were still graduate and professional schools which barred women from admittance. Women were likely to enter either co-educational or women's institutions of higher learning which imposed limitations upon their learning in subtle and unconscious ways, preparing them to be educated wives and mothers who were not encouraged to think of career options or professional potential.

Despite these difficulties and challenges to the future of higher education, no one could deny that this period of American history had seen the greatest and most rapid advancements made in the education of women in the history of humanity. At the end of the century, Susan B. Anthony reflected this way:

> Fifty years ago woman in the United States was without a recognized individuality in any department of life. No provision was made in public or private schools for her education in anything beyond the rudimentary branches. An educated woman was a rarity, and was gazed upon with something akin to awe. The women who were known in the world of letters, in the entire country, could be easily counted upon the ten fingers....The close of this nineteenth century finds every trade, vocation, and profession open to women, and every opportunity at their command for preparing themselves to follow these occupations.[36]

Women in America had and still have far to go, and educators had and still have much to learn in order to help students emerge from the restraints and limitations of the past and continue to advance in accord with promises which began to unfold in the nineteenth century.

---

[35]Cross, op. cit., 117.

[36]Frederick C. Giffin: *Woman as Revolutionary* (New York: New American Library, 1973), 81; Susan B. Anthony, "The Status of Woman, Past, Present, and Future," *The Arena*, XVII, 90 (May, 1897), 901.

The Women's Educational Equity Act

Annette TenElshof

When the Women's Equity Action League filed suit in 1970 against a number of colleges and universities under a little known and little publicized presidential directive prohibiting federal contractors from sex discrimination, the action represented the first major breakthrough enabling educational institutions to deal with discrimination against academic women. Executive Order 11246, amended by Executive Order 11375, was initially the most important protection available to women in hiring practices and was also the most widely invoked. While the provisions of the executive orders differ from those of other regulations, by complying with the provisions an institution will also fulfill the requirements of other laws.

In 1970, Order No. 4 and the "Sex Discrimination Guidelines" were issued and elaborated the concept of affirmative action. These two regulations were then combined and called Revised Order No. 4. They required that government contractors, including institutions of higher education, set goals and timetables to achieve equal employment opportunity.

Another legal weapon against discrimination in higher education is Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, which forbids discrimination in employment with respect to compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. Further legislation in the form of the Equal Pay Act of 1963 as amended by the Higher Education Act of 1972, which includes executive, professional, and administrative personnel, prohibits discrimination in salaries and fringe benefits on the basis of sex. The Equal Pay Act states that jobs which require equal skill, effort, and responsibility and are performed under similar working conditions also require equal remuneration. These laws and executive orders are basically concerned with the employment of women and the conditions of that employment.

The next major legislation, Title IX, prohibits discrimination with respect to students in matters of housing, financial aid, admissions, athletics, facilities, etc. The implementation of Title IX gives support to the concepts of equal access and equity in facilities and adds a new dimension to anti-discriminatory legislation.

However, the legislation at this point does not provide for affirmative steps, does not include curriculum, and does not mention the sex-role socialization process in the educational setting. Many women's groups were concerned and felt that further legislation was needed to develop programs which would promote educational equity for women in the United States.

Some legislators who were committed to women's equity were also concerned about the lack of legislation to meet the basic causes of discrimination. Patsy Mink and Walter Mondale sponsored a bill called the Women's Educational Equity Act which stated that

(1)...educational programs in the United States..., as presently conducted, are frequently inequitable as such programs relate to women and frequently limit the full participation of all individuals in American society.

Further, this law would

(2)...provide educational equity for women in the United States.

Public Law 93-380, Sec. 408 (b) (1-2). August 21, 1974

The specific goals for the program are:

(A) the development, evaluation, and dissemination by the applicant of curricula, textbooks, and other education materials related to educational equity;

(B) preservice and inservice training for educational personnel including guidance and counseling with special emphasis on programs and activities designed to provide education equity;

(C) research, development, and educational activities designed to advance educational equity;

(D) guidance and counseling activities, including the development of nondiscriminatory tests, designed to assure educational equity;

(E) educational activities to increase opportunities for women, including continuing educational activities and programs for underemployed and unemployed women;

(F) the expansion and improvement of educational programs and activities for women in vocational education, career education, physical education and educational administration.

Public Law 93-380, Sec. 408 (d) (1). August 21, 1974

The bill also required the establishment of an Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs which was to:

(A) advise the Commissioner with respect to general policy matters relating to the administration of this section;

(B) advise and make recommendations to the Assistant Secretary concerning the improvement of educational equity for women;

(C) make recommendations to the Commissioner with respect to the allocation of any funds pursuant to this section, including criteria developed to insure an appropriate geographical distribution of approved programs and projects throughout the Nation; and

(D) develop criteria for the establishment of program priorities.

Public Law 93-310, Sec. 408 (f) (3)

The bill was written; however, the House Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor, which had to review the bill, did not permit it to come out of the committee.

At the AAUW national convention in Washington, D.C. in April of 1973, it was announced that the women's educational equity act was having difficulty in committee and the delegates were requested to contact their state representatives. The Kansas delegation, along with many other state delegations, held sessions with their legislators. Hearings for the bill were held in July, 1973.

In the course of the hearings, the Senate and House subcommittees learned that, from birth, women face discriminatory attitudes, stereotypes and assumptions and that these are reinforced in their educational experience. In the schools, textbooks literally illustrate that women just don't count as much as men: studies show that stories, examples, and illustrations choose boys and men as subjects more frequently than girls and women. When females are represented, they are usually drawn as helpless, frightened or stupid people usually doing housework, or watching, or being rescued by males. Equally damaging are the attitudes of teachers and counselors whose different expectations of boys and girls are transmitted to the students who incorporate them into their own self-images. Boys learn to be strong, assertive and competent and girls learn to be weak, passive and dependent. Children also learn that, while boys can grow up to engage in a great variety of interesting occupations, girls will grow up only to be housewives and mothers. One thing they seldom learn is that 40% of women over 16 are in the work force and that more than 90% of women work outside the home at some time in their lives.

First Annual Report, 1975.

Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs

Passage of the bill did not actually occur until the following year, August 21, 1974. The Advisory Committee was named in 1975 and was composed of seventeen members who were "broadly representative of the general public" and were "conversant with issues involving the role and status of women in American Society."[1] The four statutory functions of the Council were:

- to advise the Commissioner with respect to general policy matters relating to the administration of the Act;
- to advise and make recommendations to the Assistant Secretary for Education concerning the improvement of educational equity for women;
- to make recommendations to the Commissioner with respect to the allocation of WEEA funds which included the development of criteria to insure an appropriate geographical distribution of approved programs and projects throughout the Nation; and
- to develop criteria for the establishment of program priorities.[2]

"To carry out its responsibilities effectively, the Council organized itself into an Executive Committee and three standing committees and left latitude for the formation of special committees as needed....In 1976, a Special Committee on Rural Women was established to implement the Council's project on the educational needs of rural women."[3]

Preceding the initial year of the awarding of grants in 1976, studies were made to review sex discrimination in education and program development and policy were formulated ("WEEAP determined from the onset not to 'create a new stereotype woman' but rather only to provide the means for increasing the options of women").[4] The WEEA Regulation establishing grant guidelines was mailed out to approximately 6,000 institutions and individuals. The 800 preapplications received were evaluated; 130 of these were asked to submit full applications; and after all processes were followed, 46 general grants ($4,350,489) and 21 small grants ($301,933) were funded. Project DELTA (Design for Equity: Leadership, Training, Attitudes) was one of the general grants which received funding.

---

[1]Women's Educational Equity Act, *First Annual Report*, September 30, 1976, p. 1.
[2]Ibid., p. 2.
[3]National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, *Second Annual Report*, 1976, p. 2.
[4]Women's Educational Equity Act, op. cit., p. 3.

And What of the Young Women?

Geraldine Hammond

In a recent journal directed to English teachers, this advertisement, this frantic cry, appeared:

> The University of ___ is looking for two or three young men who have recently received their master's degrees. Experience in teaching is not necessary. Teaching load will consist of nine hours of composition and four of literature. Salary will be $2400 for nine months, with the opportunity of earning $450 additional in night school.

The offer seems to me a good one, especially when I remember that when I was in just the circumstance of these young men I taught sixteen hours, all freshman composition, for $720 a year. There was a depression, yes, but it could hardly have made that much difference. However, that situation has been remedied and this is no personal complaint. It is rather an attempt to bring to the attention of members of this Association some facts about a minority group and perhaps to correct some mistaken ideas about that group.

The militant feminist is a pathetic and a beaten character. She brings to mind all the objections to her position before she has even stated it. I am a feminist, but only in the interest of conserving human resources and in the interest of making better use of society's full possibilities at a time when it is obvious that we need to make use of them.

The inequalities that exist between men and women in college teaching are well known to everyone and are easily put out of mind by everyone except the women themselves, especially the young women just entering the profession or still growing in it. It seems to me very strange that it is the academic, the enlightened, world which clings with death, or dying, grip to the ancient (and modern Hitlerian) ideal of woman's "place." Reasons advanced by our "best" minds for the continuation of this unequal treatment are probably the least intelligent and the least well-thought-out reasons which they are likely to advance for anything. What are these reasons? Are they based on fact, on wishes, on false concepts? Must they continue to operate?

When a young woman, and I am speaking of the well-trained, efficient, ambitious young woman, asks why her salary and status are lower than her male colleague's, she is told that it is still "a man's world" and that if she doesn't think so she should try to get a job in another institution or even in another profession and she will see at once that equal salaries are not generally given to women and men for equal work. The propounder of this reason sometimes bethinks himself in time to add that it is a deplorable situation and patently unfair, but what can he do?

The real reason behind this obvious stall is not, I think, any conscious antagonism or wish to drive women out of college teaching, but the attitude is often based on a deep-lying, even unconscious, tendency on the part of the male professor or administrator to think of woman as being out of her natural sphere in academic surroundings; so he uses the worn-out, meaningless remark as an excuse, hoping she will accept it as a reason. A woman is all right as a coed, but when she comes back after college with all the same training and preparation male students have been given,

Reprinted with permission of the American Association of University Professors Bulletin (Volume 33, Summer 1947, No. 2).

she is suspect and welcomed only as a stop-gap or a permanent instructor on the lower levels. Perhaps for all his advanced thinking, the male professor is clinging to his ancient Teutonic rank as a man and a professor and fears that his prestige would be lessened by admitting women to equal status. If that is true, then he needs seriously to reconsider the kind of education he himself is giving to women students. Do women merely swell the numbers of his Milton class, his education courses, his graduate seminars? Should he not in fairness make clear to them that they should not expect to teach in college?

Another apology offered the young woman for the obvious lack of advancement in rank and salary is this: "But you have no family to support." It is unnecessary to point out to members of this organization the utter chaos contingent on this implication. When she sees a salary scale based on careful investigation of each faculty member's financial obligations and number of dependents, she will be more inclined to give ear to this reason. Incidentally, under this system of limited free enterprise, she might logically expect to see even men's salaries stop at a certain level when they have "enough" to support their families.

Now if our suppliant were to be given as a reason this: "You are not as good a teacher as a young man of equal training would be," then she might pause for reflection and self-evaluation. For this appears to me to be the only valid reason for the differences. Yet how can such a generalization — women are not as good college teachers as men — be used seriously and conscientiously by men ordinarily wary of generalization and unproved universal statements? The feeling, it is not more, that a woman will of necessity be a poorer teacher of college students is merely another form of an innate, and inane, attitude towards women. It is akin to other generalizations: they have no sense of humor; they cannot reason logically and without emotion; they are unstable. The syllogism works out; it is sound except for its major premise: all women are inferior to all men intellectually and emotionally. I repeat that if that is what American educators believe, then it is imperative on them to change American education drastically. You cannot open all the doors through college and then with no warning close them all at graduation. At least you cannot do so morally and in good faith.

It happens that women are subject to as many individual differences within their sex as men are, a fact which college professors should know better than anyone else.

II

Since it is safe to assume that the discrepancies are not due to established and recognized differences in the abilities of the sexes, what then are the real causes of the inequalities? I think there are two main ones, and in discussing them I can only hope to expose some fallacies lurking in the unadmitted background-opinion that colors otherwise rational concepts, fallacies that cannot live in the light of intelligent, considered thought. The cause that operates most strongly, I believe, is a wish on the part of administrators and heads of departments to build prestige and reputation. Prestige can be achieved only by bringing in the ambitious, well-trained young men. Why? For no good reason except that it is like that everywhere else. Why does our University of ___ quoted above want "two or three young men?" Why not two or three people with possibilities for becoming good teachers? Because it wishes to build prestige. The remedy for this fallacious attitude is in common sense. Names, unless of well-known

scholars, will not give prestige. Only good teachers can build a good department.

Apropos of prestige, a reason frequently given for not appointing the young woman is this : "We do not want to be over-staffed with women." Over-staffed with women in nearly all departments means from ten to thirty per cent, never as high as fifty per cent. There seems to be a strong and persistent feeling that women weaken a department. However, it seems to me that students are entitled to the male and the female point of view and approach to subjects. When I maintain that women can be as good teachers as men,I do not mean that they become men teachers. They retain the valuable assets of their womanhood, feminine sensitivity and whatever else is womanly in the best sense of the word. That is not to say that they are stupidly sentimental or overly emotional. There should be more women teachers in college and more men teachers in high school to maintain a normal balance and a distributed viewpoint. It has always seemed strange to me that although there are many men teachers in women's colleges,there are never or very rarely any women in men's schools. What is the white and black magic that enables men to teach successfully both male and female students and prevents women from doing the same?

Furthermore, in regard to prestige, one of the methods by which heads of departments force or bring about raises in salaries for teachers is the use of an offer from another institution as a lever. This is not the place to discuss the ethics of this method; for the time being I shall accept it as practical, or at least as practiced. The disadvantage to the young woman here is serious. No matter how good a teacher she has become, unless she has also become famous, and I use the word advisedly, she will not receive offers of professorships or even associate or assistant professorships from other schools. They are still seeking the young men for prestige and for strengthening their departments. What can she do? She can keep on being a good teacher; she can also write a book. In her case scholarship and production are not only advisable; they are necessary if she is to expect any great degree of academic and financial advancement.

The second of these causes of discrimination against young women in the appointment of college teachers is the poor reputation of some women in college teaching. Men have had difficulties with some women teachers and these difficulties have frequently been annoying — "No more of that." For this I cannot blame them, though I can point out that there is a basis for some of these difficulties, namely, frustration. A woman who serves year after year faithfully and more conscientiously than many of her male colleagues may finally become embittered by the lack of recognition of her value; she suffers the permanent slight, the obvious scorn for her old-maidish conscientiousness,while the young men rise rapidly, sometimes even with more outside pull than inner push. However, I cannot in faith hold a brief for these women; they constitute a major cause of the difficulty of the younger, more ambitious, more capable women. I shall point out, however, the unfairness of this situation in which otherwise fair-minded men allow their attitude towards all to be based on their experiences with a few. Again the syllogism is sound, but the major premise looks foolish: This old lady is hard to get along with — therefore...I can also point out that the bitterness of even these women would disappear if reason for it were removed. I certainly do not propose that advancement should be given for length of service. Quality is the only sound basis for reward. But how will a young woman have opportunity to prove her quality when she is faced by this blank wall not of her building, this "fact" that some women may have been hard to get along with? It will even be difficult for her to

avoid bitterness herself if she is given the same treatment: small return for hard work.

III

The strange differences hinging on the marital status of men and women teachers is still another difficulty in the way of the young woman. She is not a good risk because she might get married, whereas the young man's chances at a good position are increased if he plans marriage. This may be a real problem in our present society but it is far from insoluble and will disappear entirely when it is more widely understood that a woman as well as a man can have a career and marriage both. It is hardly up to an administrator to tell her that it is impossible for her to have both unless he has moral scruples against married women teaching or is laboring under a false principle of economics. What is this contradictory concept of free enterprise that says a married woman may not work but places no top limit on the earnings of a man? In a society based on the rights of the individual, the choice should be hers. If she has made a career of teaching, she should not be asked to give it up if or when she marries. A career-teacher given opportunity and salary equal to a man's will not suddenly leave her job at marriage. In the past women have used work as a stop-gap before marriage because that is just what it was, made so by the employer himself who explained to her that her salary was low because she might leave at any time. Women doctors and lawyers do not give up their practices for marriage or because of marriage and neither would the trained and serious type of college teacher.

There are many problems, based on practices of long standing, but it is not enough to say, "It isn't fair but what can I do?" Democracy itself is built on a far different basis. If the male professor or administrator is not afraid to look closely into his own mind for fear he will see some unjustifiable or ridiculously old-fashioned ideas, then he can do something. If he wants women to go back home, and I will be the first to agree with him that that would lead to his greatest physical comfort, then he should say so clearly and without equivocation. If he believes in the minds and abilities of his women students, he can start by being consistent in his own thinking. We have trained the young women; we have encouraged them; let us follow our own precepts.

Surely in this democratic and enlightened society, nurtured by American education, we can arrive at a point where the sex of the teacher applying for a position will be an interesting and even important item of information but will not be the determining and limiting factor it now is.

The Status of Women in Higher Education: Review Essay

Marion Kilson

Despite raised consciousnesses, affirmative-action guidelines, day-care centers, and women's studies programs, the status of women in higher education promises to decline. Even were positions within institutional hierarchies allocated sex blind or preferentially to women, the impact of demographic changes and economic constraints would limit opportunities available to them. With a declining population and a restrictive economy, fewer positions will exist in academe. Consequently, even if women fill a larger proportion of academic positions than they do now, the number so employed is unlikely to be significantly increased. As it is, such societal forces threaten to undermine recent gains made by women at lower levels of academe as students and junior faculty. Men and women in higher education will have to be vigilant if institutional gains for women are to be consolidated and not eroded.

THE PATTERN OF STATUS DECLINE

The pattern of status decline is seen most clearly in institutional demise and occupational constriction for women in academe. Between 1870 and 1970, institutions of higher education increased more than four-fold in the United States, from 582 to 2,573. Among these institutions the proportion of women's colleges rose from 12 percent in 1870 to an all-time high of 20 percent in 1890, tapering off to 13 percent in 1960 and 8 percent in 1970.[1] The 298 women's colleges in 1960 had diminished to 146 (49 percent) by 1973; a large proportion (40 percent) had been transformed into coeducational or coordinate institutions, while the remainder (11 percent) were defunct.[2] The decline of women's colleges has been accompanied by a decline in occupational opportunity for women in higher education. The proportion of women within faculties and administrations has declined both in women's institutions that have become coeducational[3] and in women's colleges that have remained single-sex institutions.[4]

The demise of women's colleges has negative implications not only for professional women's occupational opportunities but for women students' educational development. An educational environment that includes both professional women role models and high intellectual expectations for all undergraduate students appears to be critical for the qualitative educational experience and subsequent careers of women students.[5] Hitherto such

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 1976, vol. 1 no. 4. © 1976 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

For advice and assistance in myriad forms, I am grateful to my Radcliffe Institute colleagues, especially Patricia Albjerg Graham, Hilda Kahn, and Carol Troyer-Shank.

[1] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Opportunities for Women in Higher Education: Their Current Participation, Prospects for the Future, and Recommendations for Action* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973), p. 71, table 6.

[2] Judy Bertelson, "Two Studies of Women in Higher Education," mimeographed (Oakland, Calif.: Mills College, 1974), p. 4.

[3] Ibid., p. 23.

[4] See, for example, Jacquelyn A. Mattfeld, "Many Are Called, But Few Are Chosen," in *Women in Higher Education*, ed. W. Todd Furniss and Patricia Albjerg Graham (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Higher Education, 1974), p. 124. For a case study of such processes in one prestigious women's college, see Alice B. Dickinson, "Smith Academic Women," *Smith Alumnae Quarterly* (February 1974), pp. 4-8.

[5] Elizabeth Tidball, "The Search for Talented Women," in *Women on Campus: The*

educational milieus have been provided most effectively by women's colleges.[6]

Status decline for women in higher education is also revealed in the diminished number of top-level administrators who are women, the decreasing proportion of tenured faculty who are women, and the increasing salary differential between men and women in colleges and universities. Between 1972 and 1975-76, the number of women "chief executive officers" in institutions of higher education decreased from 162 to 148.[7] Moreover, the proportion of women in top-level administrative positions in four-year institutions declined between 1969-70 and 1971-72: women presidents fell from 11 percent to 3 percent, women directors of development from 4 percent to 2.7 percent, women business managers from 9 percent to 2.7 percent.[8] Although the overall proportion (22 percent) of women faculty in colleges and universities remained constant from 1960 to 1971, after declining from the peak decades of the interwar years,[9] and although the proportion of women faculty has risen slightly in four-year institutions during the past decade, especially in the lower ranks,[10] the proportion of tenured women faculty dropped from 17 percent in 1971-72 to 13 percent in 1974-75. Moreover, among women faculty members, the proportion of tenured women dropped from 44 percent in 1971-72 to 27 percent in 1974-75, while the proportion of tenured male faculty only diminished slightly from 59 percent to 57 percent.[11] Although the decline of tenured men occurred only within private institutions,[12] the principal decline of tenured women was in public institutions, from 46 percent in 1971-72 to 25 percent in 1974-75 and from 36 percent to 34 percent in private institutions.[13]

Accompanying the trend of declining proportions of tenured women in academe is a growing salary differential between men and women faculty. In 1959-60 the median salary for women in four-year institutions was 84.9 percent of the median salary for men; in 1965-66, 83.4 percent; in 1971-72,

---

Unfinished Liberation, ed. Editors of *Change* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: *Change Magazine*, 1975), p. 153; Committee on the College Student of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, *The Educated Woman: Prospects and Problems* (New York: Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, 1975); K. Patricia Cross, "The Woman Student," in *Women in Higher Education*, pp. 29-50; Katherine L. Jelly, Lisa Getman, Barbara Deinhardt, and Grisel Rodriquez, "Undergraduates View the Coeducational Campus," in *Women in Higher Education*, pp. 61-71.

[6] See Catharine R. Stimpson, "Women at Bryn Mawr," in *Women on Campus*, pp. 69-84; Caroline Bird, "Women's Lib and the Women's Colleges," in *Women on Campus*, pp. 220-35.

[7] Betty M. Vetter and Eleanor L. Babco, *Professional Women and Minorities: A Manpower Resource Service* (Washington, D.C.: Scientific Manpower Commission, 1975), table A-WF-9; see also the article, "Up -- It's the Only Way to Go," *Comment* 9 (Fall 1975): 3.

[8] Vetter and Babco, tables A-WF-10 and A-WF-11.

[9] The percentage of women faculty in academe was 26 percent in 1920, and 27 percent in 1930 and 1940 (Department of Education, *Digest of Educational Statistics* [Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, 1973], table 100).

[10] The percentage of women faculty members is as follows: for all ranks, 1959-60, 19.1; 1965-66, 18.4; 1971-72, 19.0; 1974-75, 22.3; for professor, 1959-60, 9.9; 1965-66, 8.7; 1971-72, 8.6; 1974-75, 9.4; for associate professor, 1959-60, 17.5; 1965-66, 15.1; 1971-72, 14.6; 1974-75, 16.5; for assistant professor, 1959-60, 21.7; 1965-66, 19.4; 1971-72, 20.7; 1974-75, 26.5; for instructor, 1959-60, 29.3; 1965-66, 32.5; 1971-72, 39.4; 1974-75, 47.8 (Carnegie Commission, p. 111, table 7; Vetter and Babco, table A-WF-6).

[11] Vetter and Babco, tables A-WF-7 and A-WF-8.

[12] The decline was from 64 percent in 1971-72 to 53 percent in 1974-75; the proportion increased in public institutions from 57 percent in 1971-72 to 59 percent in 1974-75.

[13] Jack Magarrell, "Who Earns How Much in Academe," *Chronicle of Higher Education* 9 (February 1975): 1; Vetter and Babco, tables A-WF-7 and A-WF-8.

82.5 percent; and in 1974-75 even lower.[14] By contrast, in two-year public and private institutions, the median salary for women has been at least 90 percent of the median salary for men during the past decade.[15] When these data are considered in the light of the impact of economic constraints and projected demographic decline in the wider society on higher education, a cumulative pattern of declining status for women in higher education ominously emerges. As Juanita M. Kreps observes, "If the number of additional professors required to staff universities and colleges in the 1970s is small, the probability of improving the lot of academic women is much lower than could occur in a high-growth period such as the 1960s, even if sex discrimination were discontinued."[16]

THE PATTERN OF INEQUALITY

Coupled with the pattern of status decline for women is the prevailing pattern of inequality between women and men in American higher education. Arising from diverse psychological, cultural, and social sources,[17] the pattern of inequality is conveyed most forcefully in differential sex ratios between degree recipients and academic personnel and in the different postdoctoral career patterns of men and women. Since 1910 the proportion of women degree recipients has exceeded the proportion of women faculty in academe.[18] In 1970 women received 40.4 percent of all degrees, 41.5 percent of bachelor's degrees, 39.7 percent of master's degrees, and 13.3 percent of doctor of philosophy degrees.[19] Despite the large proportion of women students, women faculty not only are underrepresented but are concentrated in the lower ranks. Thus, while 50 percent of the men in academe were professors or associate professors in 1974-75, 25 percent of women faculty members held corresponding positions.[20] Moreover, the differential in high-ranking status between men and women is greater in universities than in either other four-year institutions or two-year institutions. Thus, in 1974-75 the proportion of faculty holding associate or full professorships was 60 percent of male faculty and 30 percent of female faculty in universities, 54 percent of male faculty and 30 percent of female faculty in other four-year institutions, and 17 percent of male faculty and 11 percent of female faculty in two-year institutions.[21] The more prestigious and influential an institution is, therefore, the greater is the inequality between men and women in American higher education.

---

[14] In 1974-75 the median salaries for women faculty represented 77.8 percent of male faculty median salaries at universities and 85.7 percent at colleges.

[15] *The Status of Women Faculty and Administration in Higher Educational Institutions, 1971-72*, NEA Research Memo no. 1973-7 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1973), pp. 1-2; Magarrell, p. 1. Of practical interest is Bergmann and Maxfeld's recent article on computing salary equity (Barbara R. Bergmann and Myles Maxfeld, Jr., "How to Analyze the Fairness of Faculty Women's Salaries on Your Campus," *AAUP Bulletin* 61 [Autumn 1975]: 262-65).

[16] Juanita M. Kreps, "The Woman Professional in Higher Education," in *Women in Higher Education*, p. 76.

[17] For perceptive discussions of these issues, see Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry; see also Florence Howe, ed., *Women and the Power to Change* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975); Saul D. Feldman, *Escape from the Doll's House* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974); Dianne S. Peters, *And Pleasantly Ignore My Sex: Academic Women, 1974* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1974); Joan Abramson, *The Invisible Woman* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975).

[18] The figures for women faculty are as follows: 1900, 19 percent; 1910, 20 percent; 1920, 26 percent; 1930, 27 percent; 1940, 27 percent; 1950, 24 percent; 1960, 22 percent; 1970, 22 percent (*Digest of Educational Statistics*, table 100); the percentage of women degree recipients (bachelors, masters, doctorates combined) is: 1900, 17 percent; 1910, 23 percent; 1920, 34 percent; 1930, 40 percent; 1940, 41 percent; 1950, 24 percent; 1960, 34 percent; 1970, 40 percent (Vetter and Babco, table G-D-3).

[19] Vetter and Babco, table G-D-2.

[20] Ibid., table A-WF-6.

[21] Ibid.

These data on status differentials between men and women faculty members have implications both for women in administrative positions and for the relations between faculty and students. On the one hand, these data suggest that the number of top-level women administrators in prestigious institutions is unlikely to increase rapidly, for as Jacquelyn Mattfeld has observed, recruitment to such positions ordinarily is from the ranks of high-status and long-term faculty.[22] On the other hand, the fact that there are few women with high-ranking and tenured positions in academe facilitates the perpetuation of certain negative stereotypes about women's intellectual interests and capabilities[23] that lead to lesser faculty involvement with those women — namely, women graduate students[24] — who experience greatest conflict about personal and professional roles.[25] Moreover, the limited proportion of women associate and full professors perpetuates both the internalization of negative feminine stereotypes by men and women faculty members and students and the maintenance of the nonsupportive Queen Bee behavior pattern among high-ranking faculty women.[26] The current status differentials between men and women in colleges and universities, therefore, have significant consequences for the diversification of women's status in academe in the future.

The pattern of inequality also expresses itself in career differentials for men and women with comparable education, as Centra's 1973 research on the postdoctoral careers of three (1950, 1960, 1968) doctoral cohorts shows. Significant differences exist in the employment patterns, time allocations, publications, and incomes of men and women in the same doctoral cohort. Thus, 95 percent of the men and 78 percent of the women engaged in full-time employment after obtaining their doctorates;[27] women's careers, but never men's, frequently were interrupted for family reasons (40 percent present interruptions, 57 percent past interruptions), including institutional nepotism rules;[28] women academics spent more time teaching and less time writing than their male cohorts;[29] men published more than women and the publication differential increased with time;[30] men earned more than women,[31] and this income differential also increased with time. The difference in men's and women's careers within academe may be attributed to factors ranging from institutional discrimination, through women's internal ambivalences which produce a pattern of "autodiscrimination," to the existence of a culturally preferred academic career pattern tailored to the image of a "family-free" man, as Arlie Russell Hochschild has so persuasively argued.[32] Synthesizing these factors in a slightly different way, Joan Abramson concludes that "the combination — an academic yardstick where productivity is the key to success and a firm

---

[22] Mattfeld (n. 4 above), p. 123.

[23] See, for example, Arlie Russell Hochschild, "Inside the Clockwork of Male Careers," in *Women and the Power to Change*, pp. 47-80; Feldman, passim; Mina Rees, "The Graduate Education of Women," in *Women in Higher Education*, pp. 178-187.

[24] Engin Inel-Holmstrom and Robert W. Holmstrom, "The Plight of the Woman Doctoral Student," *American Educational Research Journal* 11, no. 1 (1974): 1-17.

[25] K. Patricia Cross (n. 5 above), pp. 29-50.

[26] See, for example, Abramson, passim; see also Betty Richardson, *Sexism in Higher Education* (New York: Seabury Press, 1974).

[27] John A. Centra, *Women, Men, and the Doctorate* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974).

[28] Ibid., p. 46.

[29] Alan E. Bayer and Helen S. Astin, "Sex Differentials in the Academic Reward System," *Science* 188 (May 1975): 796-802.

[30] Centra, p. 72.

[31] Ibid., p. 89; Bayer and Astin, p. 801.

[32] Hochschild (n. 23 above), p. 70.

belief in the low productivity of women as a class — has served to keep women from achieving success in the academic world."[33]

THE PATTERN OF AMELIORATION

Although contemporary trends suggest that women's status in academe is declining and that status inequality between men and women persists, a pattern of amelioration has developed during the 1970s through changes in student career aspirations, student recruitment, curriculum, and affirmative action programs. While a large proportion of women doctorates are "concentrated in only six fields: anthropology, biology, education, health sciences, psychology, and Romance languages,"[34] women undergraduate and graduate students increasingly aspire to enter nontraditional fields such as dentistry, engineering, law, and business[35] and increasingly aspire to combine family and career responsibilities.[36] Second, a new source of women students is being recruited into higher education through "recurrent education" programs,[37] fostering further institutional change within academe. Third, curricular changes are being introduced through courses and programs in women's studies, which Florence Howe has termed "the educational arm of the women's movement."[38] Finally, institutions have

---

[33] Abramson, p. 69; for discussion of specific careers see the following articles in *Women on Campus:* Elaine B. Hopkins, "Unemployed! An Academic Woman's Saga," pp. 140-51; Ruth Fischer, "Black, Female — and Qualified," pp. 160-66; Nina McCain, "Jacquelyn Mattfeld of Brown," pp. 167-73. Moreover, Patricia Albjerg Graham recently has discussed the need to study the career patterns of "the women in nonprestigious positions in higher education, for that is where nearly all the women have been" (Patricia Albjerg Graham, "So Much to Do: Guides for Historical Research on Women in Higher Education," *Teachers College Record 76* (February 1975): 428).

[34] The figures are 47 percent in 1969-72 and 45 percent in 1972-75 (Joseph L. McCarthy and Dael Wolf, "Doctorates Granted to Women and Minority Group Members," *Science 189* (September 1975): 857).

[35] Vetter and Babco, table G-E-3 ("Probable Career Choices of College Freshmen by Sex, 1966 to 1973"), table G-Pro-5 ("First-Year Enrollment of Women in Professional Training, Selected Fields, 1965-72"), and table G-D-1 ("Number and Percent of Doctoral Degrees Granted to Women, by Field, 1920-1973"). See also John B. Parrish, "Women in Professional Training," *Monthly Labor Review 97* (May 1974): 41-43; Rudolph C. Blitz, "Women in the Professions, 1870-1970," *Monthly Labor Review 97* (May 1974): 34-39.

[36] Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (n. 5 above), passim.

[37] Elizabeth Hansot, "A 'Second-Chance' Program for Women," in *Women on Campus*, pp. 242-49; Pat Durchholz and Janet O'Connor, "Why Women Go Back to College," in *Women on Campus*, pp. 236-41; Jean W. Campbell, "The Nontraditional Student in Academe," in *Women in Higher Education*, pp. 192-99; Rosalind Loring, "Expanding Opportunities through Continuing Education," in *Women in Higher Education*, pp. 199-204; Jean A. Wells, *Continuing Education for Women: Current Developments* (Washington, D.C.: Women's Bureau, 1974); Eugenia Kelman and Bonnie Staley, *The Returning Woman Student: Needs of an Important Minority Group on College Campuses*, Student Development Report, vol. 12, no. 2 (Fort Collins: Colorado State University, 1974).

[38] See Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (n. 1 above), p. 242; Florence Howe, "Introduction," in *Who's Who and Where in Women's Studies*, ed. Tamar Berkowitz, Jean Mangi, and Jane Williamson (Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press, 1974), pp. vii-ix; Barbara Sicherman, "The Invisible Woman: The Case for Women's Studies," in *Women in Higher Education*, pp. 155-77; Catherine R. Stimpson, "The New Feminism and Women's Studies," in *Women on Campus*, pp. 69-84; Florence Howe, "Women and the Power to Change," in *Women and the Power to Change*, pp. 127-71. Adjunct to such programs are women's centers on campuses and in communities. For a comprehensive list of such centers, see Project on the Status and Education of Women, *Women's Centers: Where Are They?* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1975).

inaugurated affirmative action programs intended to decrease status inequities of women and minorities within higher education. The inadequacies in the operation of these programs, however, have been chronicled in general and specific terms[39] — most effectively in Joan Abramson's case study of her tenure dispute in *The Invisible Woman*. While the varied components of the ameliorative pattern are to be welcomed, their success in the foreseeable future seems doubtful given the twin constraints of economic recession and population decline which promise to increase conservative rather than innovative trends within higher education.

If this analysis of the dominant trends for women's status in academe today is correct, we must agree with Lewis Carroll's Red Queen that it will take "all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!"[40]

---

[39] See Kreps (n. 16 above), pp. 75-94; Richardson, passim; Marilyn Gittell, "The Illusion of Affirmative Action," *Change* 7 (October 1975): 39-43; Charles J. Sugnet, "The Uncertain Progress of Affirmative Action," in *Women on Campus*, pp. 53-68. Margaret C. Dunkle and Bernice Sandler, "Sex Discrimination against Students: Implications of Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972," *Inequality in Education* 18 (October 1974): 12-35; and articles by Margaret L. Rumbarger, Leo Kanowitz, Martha P. Rogers, Robben W. Fleming, and Katherine M. Klotzburger in *Women in Higher Education*, pp. 207-36. Although most of the people writing about their tenure disputes (such as Abramson and Hopkins) seem to have been unsuccessful in their pleas, success has been achieved by Kristin Morrison at Boston College (see *The Heights* (April 30, 1971 and February 4, 1974)). In order to facilitate the implementation of affirmative-action guidelines, the recently developed committees on the status of women within professional associations often have organized rosters of women in the profession and reported on the status of women. The Association of University Women issued a list of the names and address of "Professional Women's Groups" in August 1975; a great deal of the statistical data in such professional reports and rosters have been collected in Vetter and Babco's invaluable *Professional Woman and Minorities*. Additionally, articles have appeared recently on the status of women in various disciplines, such as Rona M. Fields, "The Status of Women in Psychology: How Many and How Come?" *International Journal of Group Tensions* 4 (March 1974): 93-121; Eva Ruth Kashket, Mary Louise Robbins, Loretta Leive, and Alice S. Huang, "Status of Women Microbiologists," *Science* 183 (February 1974): 488-94; and the historical biographical sketches of Lynn M. Olsen, *Women in Mathematics* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1974).

[40] Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass* (New York: Random House, 1946), p. 32. For a recent comparative view of the status of women in British higher education, see Margherita Rendel, "Men and Women in Higher Education," *Educational Review* 27 (June 1975): 192-210.

Academic Administration: The Hard Core of Sexism in Academe

Alexander W. Astin

The last few years have witnessed dramatic changes in the role of women in American colleges and universities. Hundreds of institutions now have affirmative action officers, and more faculty search committees make at least token attempts to include women among their candidates. These changes have occurred in part because of the women's movement, in part because of federal affirmative action legislation, and in part because research has demonstrated significant sex discrimination in awarding salary and tenure to women faculty members (Astin & Bayer, 1972; Bayer & Astin, 1975).

One area where sex discrimination has received relatively little attention is in recruiting and hiring administrators. Even though more institutions than ever before are advertising openings for top administrators, a casual look at the makeup of most college administrators reveals that administration is still a male-dominated field. To a large extent, key administrative positions in American higher education are occupied by men. To increase the representation of women in college and university administration will take certain changes in recruiting and hiring policies.

NUMBER OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

How many women occupy top administrative posts in higher educational institutions in the United States? Table 1 shows the number of women in the five highest-paying positions in the central administration of American colleges and universities. These five positions have been ranked by median salary, generally regarded as an index of status or power. Except for chief student life officers, fewer than 10% of these top posts are occupied by women. Since the percentage of women in these positions declines when single-sex institutions are omitted (last column), one can conclude that the overall percentages are inflated by the high concentration of women administrators in women's colleges. Even when women's colleges are included, the representation of women in top administrative posts is far below their representation on college faculties or in student bodies.

Table 2 shows the representation of women among deans of major schools and colleges. For only two — nursing and home economics — are women a majority among deans. This result is not so surprising, considering that most men avoid these fields (see Astin, King, & Richardson, 1975). Library science, another field with relatively high proportions of women students, shows a modest proportion of women deans (30.3%), but the representation of women drops off dramatically for social work (18.2%), public health (16.7%), and physical education (10%).

The seven deanships with the lowest proportion of women or no women at all are the highest-paying deanships. In fact, the salary figures for six of these seven deanships show a higher median salary than all central administrative positions except the president (see Table 1). In five of these seven deanships, there are *no* women.

Reprinted with permission of the UCLA Educator (Volume 19, No. 3 of the Spring, 1977 issue).

This study was supported in part by a grant from the Exxon Education Foundation.

Is it possible that women are more highly represented among persons occupying low-level administrative posts?

TABLE 1
Women in Major Administrative Positions

Position	Men** (N)	Women** (N)	Percentage of Women: All Institutions	Percentage of Women: Coeducational Institutions	Median Salary*
President	1,808	132	6.8	5.6	$34,800
Chief academic officer	1,659	160	8.8	7.2	27,500
Director of planning	278	9	3.1	2.5	26,000
Chief business officer	1,684	153	8.3	7.5	24,378
Chief student life officer	1,219	176	12.6	10.6	22,750

Chronicle of Higher Education, February 17, 1976. (Certain high-paying deanships, not generally regarded as part of central administration, and staff legal counsel, not generally regarded as administrators, have been omitted.)

**Institutions reporting sex of incumbent from the 1972-73 Higher Education General Information Survey.

TABLE 2
Sex of Deans of Schools and Colleges

School or College	Men (N)	Women (N)	Percentage of Women	Median Salary*
Nursing	25	292	92.0	$24,000
Home economics	15	109	87.9	25,575
Library science	62	27	30.3	
Social work	99	22	18.2	29,000
Public health	30	6	16.7	
Physical education	226	26	10.0	
Fine arts	212	23	9.6	
Natural resources	50	5	9.1	
Continuing education	495	45	8.3	
Graduate	389	28	6.7	30,300
Education	424	30	6.6	28,848
Music	171	11	6.0	23,700
Evening division	284	17	5.6	
Business	489	24	4.7	28,000
Extension	173	8	4.4	25,627
Arts and sciences	492	22	4.3	28,000
Journalism	68	3	4.2	
Agriculture	103	3	2.8	29,950
Technology	173	4	2.3	23,500
Vocational education	258	5	1.9	22,040
Law	111	2	1.8	39,200
Architecture	63	1	1.6	31,645
Dentistry	54	0	0.0	42,907
Engineering	237	0	0.0	33,000
Medicine	63	0	0.0	52,000
Pharmacy	53	0	0.0	35,082
Veterinary medicine	20	0	0.0	
All colleges	4,839	663	13.7	

Chronicle of Higher Education, February 17, 1976.

Table 3 shows the percentage of women in middle- and low-level positions. Again, the positions have been ranked by the proportion of women occupying them. That the percentages are generally higher than those in Tables 1 and 2 suggests that women are most successful in obtaining middle- and low-level administrative positions. Seven of the eight lowest-paying positions (median salary less than $17,000) are occupied by the highest proportion of women (more than 15%). Conversely, all six of the highest-paying positions (median salary $20,000 or more) have fewer than 15% women. Once again, there is a substantial negative relationship between the median salary and the proportion of women occupying the position.

WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Are women administrators equally represented in different types of institutions, or are those women occupying top administrative posts located primarily in institutions for women? A substantial number of private institutions in the United States — primarily Roman Catholic colleges and nonsectarian colleges for women — have traditionally been run by and for women. Since many of these institutions have recently become coeducational, it is difficult to obtain an accurate picture of where the top administrators are located simply by excluding institutions that are formally designated single-sex colleges (Table 1).

Table 4 shows the distribution of men and women college presidents by type of institution. Of the 132 women college presidents, 77 are in Roman Catholic four-year colleges, and 32 are in private two-year colleges. Of the latter group, 23 are in Catholic colleges and 7 in colleges for women. One of the remaining two is president of a college with 50 students controlled by the Church of God, and the other is president of a nonsectarian institution with 2,500 students in Puerto Rico. Thus, all but 25 of these 132 women are presidents of either Roman Catholic or women's colleges.

One percent (N=3) of the presidents of public four-year colleges is women. One is president of a former women's institution in a large eastern city; the second heads a college for nursing in a large southwestern state. The third is president of a former normal school, until recently attended primarily by women; the institution still offers residential facilities only for women. In short, even the few women presidents of public four-year colleges preside over institutions that traditionally have been exclusively or primarily for women.

TABLE 3
Women in Middle- and Low-Level Administrative Positions

Position	*Institutions* (N)*	*Percentage of Women*	*Median Salary***
Bookstore manager	1,192	45.9	$11,693
Librarian	1,907	41.9	19,000
Registrar	1,485	36.7	17,568
Director of food services	600	34.3	16,696
Director of student placement	713	28.9	16,080
Director of student housing	530	25.1	15,082
Director of information office	413	24.5	15,636
Director of financial aid	1,346	24.4	15,547
Director of student counseling	964	20.0	19,017
Director of public relations	998	19.6	17,799
Director of personnel services	557	16.9	18,430
Director of admissions	1,508	15.8	18,500
Student center director	630	15.1	16,000
Director of community services	235	14.9	20,873
Director of institutional studies	350	13.4	20,423
Purchasing agent	700	12.9	15,750
Comptroller	766	12.0	19,229
Budget director	281	9.6	21,600
Director of computer center	831	4.9	19,800
Director of development	1,073	4.7	22,700
Staff legal counsel	93	3.2	25,580
Director of physical plant	1,387	1.5	17,593
Director of athletics	895	1.1	20,000

*Institutions reporting sex of incumbent from the 1972-73 Higher Education General Information Survey.
***Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 17, 1976.

None of the 129 public and private universities is governed by a woman president. This fact, together with the finding that more other institutions that have women presidents are, or have been until recently, exclusively for women, suggests that women candidates are simply not seriously considered when most coeducational institutions recruit new presidents.

Since these data were collected in 1973, one might argue that the situation

may have changed dramatically in the past four years and that women are now much better represented in top leadership posts. To test this possibility, a current list of college presidents — maintained by the American Council on Education and updated weekly by the staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program at the University of California, Los Angeles — was consulted. The results of this examination show clearly that the situation remains virtually unchanged: As of May 1977, only about one percent of all presidents of public four-year colleges and public and private universities is women. The situation in public four-year colleges remains completely unchanged: Only three of 309 presidents are women, and two of these preside over institutions that were formerly exclusively or primarily for women. Only two of 113 public university presidents are women, and one of these presides over a women's university. *None* of the 65 presidents of private universities is a woman.

TABLE 4
Sex of College President, by Type of Institution

Type of Institution	*Institution (N)*	*Men*	*Women*	*Percentage of Women*
Universities				
Public	81	81	0	0.0
Private	48	48	0	0.0
Four-year colleges				
Public	303	300	3	1.0
Roman Catholic	192	115	77	40.1
Protestant	300	293	7	2.3
Nonsectarian	281	271	10	3.6
Two-year colleges				
Public	559	556	3	.5
Private	176	144	32	18.1

SOURCE: National Center for Educational Statistics.

SELECTION AND RECRUITMENT PROCESS

Do these data constitute evidence of outright sex discrimination in recruiting college and university presidents? It is difficult to provide a definitive answer to that question, given the complex and somewhat unpredictable nature of the recruiting process. A partial answer may lie in the pool of candidates from which college presidents are usually selected. Although presidential candidates may come from a variety of positions, the most frequent steps on the ladder of academic administration are probably chief academic officer and dean of the college of arts and sciences. Persons aspiring to college presidencies are frequently advised to seek either of these posts as a step toward their ultimate goal.

Table 5 shows the distribution of women in these two high administrative positions. To provide a context to evaluate the results, the table includes the percentage of women on the faculties of different types of institutions. Since occupants of these two positions are frequently chosen from among the faculty ranks, comparing the percentage of women on the faculty (last column) with the percentages of women occupying the posts of chief academic officer and liberal arts dean provides a basis for judging whether the number of women in these posts is proportional to their representation on the faculty.

The results in Table 5 are remarkably similar to those in Table 4. Women chief academic officers and liberal arts deans are highly concentrated in the Roman Catholic two- and four-year colleges, and virtually nonexistent in the public and private universities and public four-year colleges. The *relative* concentrations of women top administrators and faculty members are similar, in that they are most highly represented in Roman Catholic two- and four-year institutions and least represented in public and private universities. Differences in *absolute* percentages of women administrators

compared with women faculty, however, are substantial for all types of institutions, particularly the universities and public colleges. Using the percentage of women on the faculty as a guide, women are underrepresented as chief academic officers in the public two-year colleges by a factor of 10 to 1 and in the public four-year colleges by a factor of more than 20 to 1.

Tables 4 and 5 also provide striking evidence of sex discrimination in hiring top administrators by both public and private universities: Of the approximately 125 universities for which data were available, there are no presidents, one chief academic officer, and one dean of arts and sciences who are women. Using the proportion of women on university faculties as a guide, women are underrepresented in each of these three top university positions by a factor of more than 15 to 1.

CONSEQUENCES FOR STUDENTS

One practical consequence of sex discrimination in hiring top administrators is that both men and women students who enter college for the first time are exposed to a male-dominated and male-oriented administration. The absence of women in top administration can create an environment that lacks not only role models for women who might ultimately become administrators, but also the unique perspective that women might bring to the varied tasks of administering a college.

TABLE 5
Sex of Chief Academic Officer and Dean of Arts and Sciences by Type of Institution and Percentage of Women on Faculty

Type of Institution	*Chief Academic Officer* Institution* (N)	Women (N)	Women Percentage	*Dean of Arts and Sciences* Institution* (N)	Women (N)	Women Percentage	*Women on Faculty* Institution* (N)	Mean Percentage
All institutions	1,819	160	8.8	512	21	4.1	2,051	29.0
Universities								
Public	80	1	1.3	77	0	0.0	68	17.7
Private	47	0	0.0	45	1	2.2	44	16.8
Four-year colleges								
Public	299	3	1.0	180	2	1.1	316	24.5
Roman Catholic	189	74	39.2	30	5	16.7	194	42.0
Protestant	291	19	6.5	21	1	4.8	300	23.4
Nonsectarian	256	25	10.0	42	2	4.8	307	22.9
Two-year colleges								
Public	503	15	3.0	112	9	8.0	644	30.4
Private	154	23	14.9	4	1	20.0	178	44.4

*Institutions reporting sex of incumbent from 1972-73 Higher Education General Information Survey.

TABLE 6
Percentage of Entering Freshmen Exposed to Men and Women Presidents and Chief Academic Officers
(N=1,829 Institutions)

Sex of President, Academic Officer	*Institutions* (N)	*Percentage of Entering Freshmen Exposed* Women (N=617,317)	Men (N=706,635)	Total (N=1,323,952)
Both women	86	1.9	.5	1.2
One woman, one man	115	4.8	2.8	3.7
Both men	1,628	93.3	96.7	95.1

How many new freshmen are exposed to institutional environments controlled by men, by women, and by both sexes? Table 6 shows the number of institutions in which the top two administrative posts — president and chief academic officer — are occupied by men, by women, and by a man and a woman, and percentages of men and women freshmen who enter those institutions. Clearly, although women are slightly more likely to enter colleges in which one or both top positions are occupied by a woman,

the vast majority of both sexes enrolls in colleges in which both positions are held by men. Indeed, 19 of every 20 new college freshmen attend an institution in which the top two administrators are men.

Table 7 includes the dean of the college of arts and sciences in the analysis. Fewer than half the institutions have such a position and most are in universities. The table shows results strikingly similar to those in Table 6: Virtually none of the students (only a few hundred men and women) enrolls at an institution in which all three top administrative posts are held by women. About one student in 20 enrolls at an institution in which at least one of these posts is occupied by a woman. Thus, 19 out of every 20 freshmen enter an institution in which all three key administrative posts are held by men.

TABLE 7

Percentage of Entering Freshmen Exposed to Men and Women Presidents, Chief Academic Officers, and Deans of Arts and Sciences

(N=629,190 Freshmen at 469 Institutions)

Sex of President, Academic Officer, Dean	Institution (N)	Percentage of Entering Freshmen Exposed		
		Women (N=288,655)	Men (N=340,535)	Total (N=629,190)
All three women	4	.2	.0	.1
Two women, one man	1	.1	.1	.1
Two men, one woman	20	4.6	4.4	.1
All three men	444	95.1	95.5	95.3

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Clearly, women are grossly underrepresented in all top administrative posts in American colleges and universities. What appears to be a modest representation among college presidents and academic deans is, on closer examination, a relatively high representation of women among administrators in colleges for women. Private universities and public institutions of all types show the greatest lack of women administrators. A handful of women occupies top administrative posts in public two- and four-year colleges, while virtually no women occupy these posts in public and private universities. Among both top- and middle-level administrative positions, there is a strong negative correlation between the average salary and the proportion of women occupying the position.

A more recent survey by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges suggests that change in women occupying low-level posts may have occurred since the data for this article were collected (mid-1973), but on closer inspection the picture for *academic* administration shows little change. While the survey shows some increase in the proportion of women in low-level positions at the 133 member institutions of the association, which includes most public universities and some large public four-year colleges, little change occurred in the proportion of women presidents, chief academic officers, and deans. By mid-1975, only 0.8% of the presidents and 1.1% of the chief officers of administrative divisions were women. Of the 156 women deans — 15.7% of all deans in 1975 — more than half were deans of either home economics or nursing schools. The increase in women occupying low-level positions was interpreted as evidence of progress, but it is difficult to accept the conclusion that "It is from this pool of administrators that many of the higher-level administrators are chosen." Traditionally, presidents and top academic officers are chosen from among the faculty, not only among directors of student services, registrars, librarians, personnel directors, assistants to academic administrators, directors of public information, affirmative action officers, and similar positions which accounted for most of the increase.

Why are women so underrepresented in top administrative posts? Several factors are probably operative: Traditionally, search committees for top positions in academic administration are dominated by older male faculty members, many of whom are unlikely to take any woman candidate seriously. At the same time, many talented women faculty members may not have devoted the same effort as their male colleagues to making themselves visible to search committees. A number of studies on sex differences have documented clearly the distinctions between men and women in status aspirations, interpersonal aggressiveness, and dominance.

Still another potential obstacle is the criteria used for selection. Most search committees for high-level administrative posts give considerable weight to prior administrative experience or even "high-level" administrative experience. Since many potential women candidates lack such experience, they may not be considered seriously by committees or, if such criteria are included in the position announcement, may never become candidates in the first place.

Although it is not possible to assess the relative importance of these and other explanations, the underrepresentation of women in administration indicates a need for certain changes in recruitment, selection, and promotion:

1. Institutions should undertake a serious appraisal of the representation of women among their top administrators, particularly in positions that are rungs on the career ladder for potential college presidents (chief academic officers, administrative vice presidents, and deans of arts and sciences and of other major colleges).
2. Institutions should undertake a careful study of the processes by which women are bypassed in recruiting and selecting persons for posts that usually lead to top administrative positions (department chairpersons, deans, and so forth). The selection processes for these middle-level administrative positions should be scrutinized and changes undertaken to encourage more women to become candidates. In particular, the requirement that the candidate have prior administrative experience should be questioned.
3. Search committees, as a matter of routine, should include women on their list of *serious* candidates. Since women may be more reticent than men to make their interest in administrative positions known, search committees should actively solicit interest among potential women candidates.
4. Active recruitment is perhaps less critical in filling presidencies than in filling other top administrative posts, given the dearth of women currently holding these other positions and the fact that presidents are typically recruited from the ranks of other top administrators. In other words, simply filling a few more presidencies with women will not remedy the basic lack of women in positions that usually lead to the presidency.

REFERENCES

Astin, H. S., & Bayer, A. E. Sex discrimination in academe. *Educational Record*, 1972, 53, 101.

Astin, A. W., King, M. R., & Richardson, G. T. *The American freshman: National norms for fall 1975*. Los Angeles: University of California, Graduate School of Education, 1975.

Bayer, A.E., Astin, H. S. Sex differentials in the academic reward system. *Science*, May 23, 1975, 796-802.

Three's a Crowd: The Dilemma of the Black Woman in Higher Education

Constance M. Carroll

Four years ago, if anyone had said to me that the black woman in higher education faces greater risks and problems now than in the past, I doubt I would have taken the remark seriously. I would have marveled at the rhetoric and pointed to federal legislation enacted on the crest of the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, and nodded proudly at the few blacks in token ("you've got to begin somewhere") positions in major institutions. I would have pointed to such outstanding black women as Mary McLeod Bethune, Mary Church Terrell, Coretta King, and Shirley Chisholm. "A great deal still needs to be done," I would have said, "but blacks, including black women, have come a long way."

In 1972, after four years of teaching and working in a university administration, I would nod my head in ready agreement if the same remark were made. My mind was changed not by startling new studies or surveys on the subject — indeed there are none — but by personal experience and by listening to accounts of black women educators and administrators across the country. Black women in higher education are isolated, underutilized, and often demoralized. They note the efforts made to provide equal opportunities for black men and white women in higher education, while they somehow are left behind in the wake of both the black and feminist movements. The intent of this chapter is to assess the situation of black women in higher education — undergraduates, faculty, and administrators.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE BLACK WOMAN

In the past two decades, a wealth of material has appeared on the subject of blacks in higher education; but most of these studies concern only black men. This is understandable since the great majority of blacks who have received advanced degrees in higher education are men. In a 1968 survey of doctoral and professional degrees conferred by black institutions (see Table 9.1), it was found that 91 percent were awarded to black men, only 9 percent to black women. Such data militate against the general assumption that black women have been included, on an equal basis with men, in the movement toward equal rights and increased educational and employment opportunities.

TABLE 9.1

Professional Degrees Conferred by Black Institutions in 1968 by Sex and Field of Specialization

Field	*Number of Degrees*	*Men (percent)*	*Women (percent)*
Medicine (M.D.)	125	85.6	14.4
Dentistry (D.D.S.)	84	95.0	5.0
Law (LL.B.)	146	90.4	9.6
Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.)	29	96.5	3.5
Theology (Th.D.)	45	97.8	2.2
Total number and overall percentages	435	91.0	9.0

SOURCE: Jackson 1972a.

"Three's a Crowd: The Dilemma of the Black Woman in Higher Education," by Constance M. Carroll, from Academic Women on the Move, *edited by Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood,* © *1973 by Russell Sage Foundation, New York.*

AUTHOR'S NOTE: I am grateful for the useful discussion and criticism of Dr. Konnilyn Feig and Dr. Rebecca Carroll.

The few black women in academe today feel isolated because they are isolated. Jacqueline Johnson Jackson summarizes the situation well:

> Even if the facts were narrowed to higher education only, it is still true that black females have been severely disadvantaged. In 1940, a slightly larger number of black males (25 years and older) were more likely to complete four or more years of college than their female counterparts. Twenty years later, the pattern had reversed, when a very small percentage of black females in that same age group had completed higher school grades than had black males. By 1970, though, a larger percentage of black males (21 years and older) had completed four or more years of college (Jackson 1972b:102).

Even though black women enter college in roughly the same or often larger proportions than do black men (see Table 9.2), black men are more likely to receive an advanced degree beyond the Master's degree and thereby gain access to positions in colleges and universities. One has only to glance at the faculty or staff directory of any university or college to note the absence of black women. My own institution, the University of Pittsburgh, represents a microcosm of this nationwide situation (see Table 9.3). Eight per cent of the professional staff are black, and a slightly larger proportion of the white staff members than of the minority staff members are women (17 percent compared to 14 percent). The most significant contrast is the difference in rank distribution — white men and black men markedly exceed white women and black women at the upper ranks. White men constitute 50 percent of the associate or full professor ranks, black men 31 percent, white women 19 percent, and black women 3 percent. Clearly, sex is more of a handicap than race in the upper ranks of the teaching staff at the University of Pittsburgh, and the disproportion between the sexes is far greater for blacks than for whites. Among whites, men are about two and a half times more likely than women to be in the upper ranks, but among blacks, men are ten times more likely than women to enjoy higher status.

TABLE 9.2.
Proportion of Black Students in College Freshman Classes, Fall 1971, by Type of Institution and Sex
(in percentages)

Type of Institution	Men	Women
Coeducational Colleges		
Nonsectarian	12.0	13.3
Catholic	2.9	3.5
Single-Sex Colleges		
Nonsectarian	5.3	16.9
Catholic	3.0	3.1
Predominantly Black Colleges	94.7	97.5

SOURCE: American Council of Education 1971:55.

Consistent with this profile is the tendency for women of both races to be disproportionately represented in such nontenured or "marginal" academic statuses as research associate or professional librarians. Much the same picture holds in the instance of administrative posts. These positions are far more likely to go to black men than black women — a difference also found among white academics. Jackson is right in saying,

> One must...understand that black males have had greater access to the more prestigious institutions of higher learning. This means that the occupational opportunities of black females have been limited (Jackson 1972b:102).

TABLE 9.3.
Full-Time Professional Staff at the University of Pittsburgh, Fall 1970, by Race and Sex

Rank	White Men		White Women		Minority Men*		Minority Women*	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Full professor	420	27	25	7	21	17	—	—
Associate professor	355	23	42	12	17	14	1	3
Assistant professor	483	31	128	38	43	36	16	50
Instructor	196	13	91	27	27	22	11	34
Assistant instructor	45	3	29	9	6	5	2	6
Lecturer or teacher	68	4	20	6	7	6	2	6
Total teaching ranks	1,567		335		121		32	
Research associate or professional librarian	38	2	58	15	12	9	6	16
Total professional staff	1,605		393		133		38	
Total faculty (by race)			1,998				171	
Percent female (by race)			17				14	

SOURCE: Computed by author from university catalog.
*Predominantly black.

This situation is not unique to institutions of higher learning. The black woman's status in higher education mirrors her impact on the national scene. One can leaf through the now famous 1971 *Ebony* roster of America's 100 leading blacks and find the names of only *nine* women. The problem is clear. New surveys and data are not necessary to document what is painfully manifest: Mary Church Terrell, Jeanne Noble, and Shirley Chisholm notwithstanding, the black woman has been excluded from institutions of higher education as she has been excluded from all other opportunities.

For the most part, black women college graduates have moved into areas that traditionally have been "open" to them, e.g., elementary and secondary education, social work, and nursing. The United States Bureau of the Census survey of population employment in 1960 showed that among employed black women, 5 percent were public school teachers; 19 percent were nurses; 5 percent were in social work; and 3.2 percent were health technicians. In comparison, 1.1 percent were employed by colleges as presidents (notably Bennett, a black women's college), professors, and instructors; 0.1 percent were lawyers or judges; 0.3 percent were physicians and surgeons (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1964). I see the same trends among black women students whom I counsel, either because they were guided into these areas or because they believe that these are the only areas open to them.

Even in those areas where their numbers are large, black women rarely receive the same promotional advancements as black men. In public school systems, few become principals and even fewer are promoted to upper administrative posts. The same is true in social and government agencies. This is not the case for black men, who are usually given positions in which they can be highly visible in an agency's or institution's "crusade" for equal employment or affirmative action. For some uncanny reason, a black woman at a board meeting is not thought to have the same "visibility" as a black male. It would be easy to say that white men who control these agencies and institutions can identify more easily with black men and thereby practice an "unconscious" sexism within their affirmative action programs. We are all familiar with the shock value of the joke:

— I saw God last night.
— Really? What's he like?
— Well, *he's* a *woman* and she's *black!*

When one ponders this testimony to what the white male really feels to be his most polar opposite, one wonders how far we have come and how far we can really expect to go. The strongest antagonism in the joke is the *God: woman* equation; that is, the tension between sexual "opposites" (male language) appears to be greater and more difficult to transcend than the antagonism between the races.

There is no more isolated subgroup in academe than black women. They have neither race nor sex in common with white males, who dominate the decision-making stratum of academe; black males in academe at least share with white males their predominance over women. Even in black educational agencies and institutions, there is a disproportionately greater number of black males than black females in important positions. At the University of Pittsburgh, for example, there are only three women among the seventeen faculty members of the Black Studies Department. No calculator is necessary to count the number of black women holding responsible appointments in the NAACP, the Urban League, black colleges, black studies departments, and minority programs in white institutions. Where they *are* found, women tend to be at lower salaries and to wait longer for promotion through the *cursus honorum*.

When occupational comparisons are made, it becomes quite clear that black women have *usually had the greatest access to the worst jobs at the lowest earnings*. Black females have consistently been in the minority among black physicians, college presidents, attorneys, architects and other high-level positions (Jackson 1972b:102).

It is clear that when translated into actual opportunities for employment and promotional and educational benefits, the civil rights movement really meant rights for black men, just as, historically, the rights of men have referred to the rights of white men.

In this framework, black women feel their academic opportunities are limited, that there are barriers to their futures in higher education and a built-in isolation in an academic career. Unlike white and black men, who more frequently are selected for apprenticeships or assistantships to male "people developers," black women have had very few models or champions to encourage and assist them in their development. Black women have had to develop themselves on their own, with no help from whites or black men, in order to "make it" in academic institutions. This has taken its toll on black women in all areas of life and work.

UNDERGRADUATE WOMEN

In talking with black women undergraduates, I have noticed an almost fierce single-mindedness in their preparation for careers. More than half express a desire to pursue careers in "traditional" areas, e.g., education, social work. With very few exceptions, they insist that they are fully prepared to pursue these careers despite plans for marriage. These findings are consistent with those found by Ladner (1971), Noble (1956), and others. Black women undergraduates feel the pressures of both racial and sexual discrimination, and choose education and the hard struggle of career mobility as the "way out." Yet, they have few role models with whom to identify in developing healthy self-concepts. The great majority of their professors are white men, or, if they take black studies courses, black men. Rarely do they see black women in responsible academic or administrative positions; and so students must look to each other for support and role models. As a result, they often form peer groups similar to extended family structures.

In their survey of black students at predominantly white univesities and colleges, Willie and Levy (1972) found that the greatest degree of social

TABLE 9.3.
Full-Time Professional Staff at the University of Pittsburgh, Fall 1970, by Race and Sex

Rank	White Men		White Women		Minority Men*		Minority Women*	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Full professor	420	27	25	7	21	17	—	—
Associate professor	355	23	42	12	17	14	1	3
Assistant professor	483	31	128	38	43	36	16	50
Instructor	196	13	91	27	27	22	11	34
Assistant instructor	45	3	29	9	6	5	2	6
Lecturer or teacher	68	4	20	6	7	6	2	6
Total teaching ranks	1,567		335		121		32	
Research associate or professional librarian	38	2	58	15	12	9	6	16
Total professional staff	1,605		393		133		38	
Total faculty (by race)			1,998				171	
Percent female (by race)			17				14	

SOURCE: Computed by author from university catalog.
*Predominantly black.

This situation is not unique to institutions of higher learning. The black woman's status in higher education mirrors her impact on the national scene. One can leaf through the now famous 1971 *Ebony* roster of America's 100 leading blacks and find the names of only *nine* women. The problem is clear. New surveys and data are not necessary to document what is painfully manifest: Mary Church Terrell, Jeanne Noble, and Shirley Chisholm notwithstanding, the black woman has been excluded from institutions of higher education as she has been excluded from all other opportunities.

For the most part, black women college graduates have moved into areas that traditionally have been "open" to them, e.g., elementary and secondary education, social work, and nursing. The United States Bureau of the Census survey of population employment in 1960 showed that among employed black women, 5 percent were public school teachers; 19 percent were nurses; 5 percent were in social work; and 3.2 percent were health technicians. In comparison, 1.1 percent were employed by colleges as presidents (notably Bennett, a black women's college), professors, and instructors; 0.1 percent were lawyers or judges; 0.3 percent were physicians and surgeons (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1964). I see the same trends among black women students whom I counsel, either because they were guided into these areas or because they believe that these are the only areas open to them.

Even in those areas where their numbers are large, black women rarely receive the same promotional advancements as black men. In public school systems, few become principals and even fewer are promoted to upper administrative posts. The same is true in social and government agencies. This is not the case for black men, who are usually given positions in which they can be highly visible in an agency's or institution's "crusade" for equal employment or affirmative action. For some uncanny reason, a black woman at a board meeting is not thought to have the same "visibility" as a black male. It would be easy to say that white men who control these agencies and institutions can identify more easily with black men and thereby practice an "unconscious" sexism within their affirmative action programs. We are all familiar with the shock value of the joke:

— I saw God last night.
— Really? What's he like?
— Well, *he's a woman* and she's *black!*

When one ponders this testimony to what the white male really feels to be his most polar opposite, one wonders how far we have come and how far we can really expect to go. The strongest antagonism in the joke is the *God: woman* equation; that is, the tension between sexual "opposites" (male language) appears to be greater and more difficult to transcend than the antagonism between the races.

There is no more isolated subgroup in academe than black women. They have neither race nor sex in common with white males, who dominate the decision-making stratum of academe; black males in academe at least share with white males their predominance over women. Even in black educational agencies and institutions, there is a disproportionately greater number of black males than black females in important positions. At the University of Pittsburgh, for example, there are only three women among the seventeen faculty members of the Black Studies Department. No calculator is necessary to count the number of black women holding responsible appointments in the NAACP, the Urban League, black colleges, black studies departments, and minority programs in white institutions. Where they *are* found, women tend to be at lower salaries and to wait longer for promotion through the *cursus honorum*.

> When occupational comparisons are made, it becomes quite clear that black women have *usually had the greatest access to the worst jobs at the lowest earnings*. Black females have consistently been in the minority among black physicians, college presidents, attorneys, architects and other high-level positions (Jackson 1972b:102).

It is clear that when translated into actual opportunities for employment and promotional and educational benefits, the civil rights movement really meant rights for black men, just as, historically, the rights of men have referred to the rights of white men.

In this framework, black women feel their academic opportunities are limited, that there are barriers to their futures in higher education and a built-in isolation in an academic career. Unlike white and black men, who more frequently are selected for apprenticeships or assistantships to male "people developers," black women have had very few models or champions to encourage and assist them in their development. Black women have had to develop themselves on their own, with no help from whites or black men, in order to "make it" in academic institutions. This has taken its toll on black women in all areas of life and work.

UNDERGRADUATE WOMEN

In talking with black women undergraduates, I have noticed an almost fierce single-mindedness in their preparation for careers. More than half express a desire to pursue careers in "traditional" areas, e.g., education, social work. With very few exceptions, they insist that they are fully prepared to pursue these careers despite plans for marriage. These findings are consistent with those found by Ladner (1971), Noble (1956), and others. Black women undergraduates feel the pressures of both racial and sexual discrimination, and choose education and the hard struggle of career mobility as the "way out." Yet, they have few role models with whom to identify in developing healthy self-concepts. The great majority of their professors are white men, or, if they take black studies courses, black men. Rarely do they see black women in responsible academic or administrative positions; and so students must look to each other for support and role models. As a result, they often form peer groups similar to extended family structures.

In their survey of black students at predominantly white univesities and colleges, Willie and Levy (1972) found that the greatest degree of social

mobility and "freedom" among black students exists in large institutions, particularly those in which the black student population is sizable.

> On campuses where black populations are relatively small and the social lives of their members are limited to interaction with other black students, the black-student groups take on the character of extended families; when this occurs, all relationships, including those that might otherwise be secondary, become intensely personal. The black students who make unlimited claims upon each other find such relationships sometimes supportive, but they also find them sometimes stultifying and confining (Willie and Levy 1972:52).

Willie and Levy also demonstrate that even on large campuses, the situation is far from ideal. Black men have more freedom than black women to date both black and white students.

> While nearly all blacks on white campuses often feel isolated and confined, it is the black women who feel it most heavily...our data indicates that the dating situation may be a function of the absence of opportunities (Willie and Levy 1972:76).

The black women undergraduates with whom I have spoken confirm these assertions. They feel locked-in socially, are not awarded leadership roles in black student groups, do not see impressive role models with whom to identify, and as a result, they turn to their studies in the hope of escaping their dilemma some time in the future. In this respect, they are not unlike the small groups of black students on small campuses.

BLACK WOMEN PROFESSORS AND ADMINISTRATORS

The sheer paucity of black women among the faculty and administration in colleges and universities tends to force black women into a small, isolated community. My own appointment is in the College of Arts and Sciences, which puts me in touch with most academic departments of the university. Nevertheless, with the exception of black studies and minority programs, I never come in contact with another black woman professor or administrator in my day-to-day activities. This seems to be typical for most of the black women in similar positions. There is no one with whom to share experiences and gain support, no one with whom to identify, no one on whom a black woman can model herself. It takes a great deal of psychological strength "just to get through the day," the endless lunches, and meetings in which one is always "different." The feeling is much like the exhaustion a foreigner speaking an alien tongue feels at the end of the day.

In the wake of the HEW investigations of several hundred universities for non-compliance with the federal guidelines concerning equal treatment of minorities and women, black women have raised their level of expectations and aspirations, just as black men and white women have done. Affirmative action programs and recruitment programs have sprung up across the country, spotlighting the inequities and proposing solutions to them. Colleges and universities have stepped up their hiring of black women in the same way they have gradually increased the roster of black men. They have been recruited to fill secretarial positions, to staff black studies and minority programs and, in rare cases, junior administrative posts. Overall, however, significant change has not yet occurred. In 1971, the total number of minority women faculty at the University of Pittsburgh was 57 (including part-time faculty), representing 1.8 percent of the total faculty of 3,043; the number of minority males in 1971 was 180, or 5.9 percent of the total faculty. There has been an increase of blacks of both sexes since 1970, but the rate of increase has been far greater for men than for women. Viewing these developments, black women feel a sense of frustration and hopelessness. It seems that just as civil rights in the 1950s and 1960s for the most part benefited black men, so affirmative action programs in the 1970s may largely benefit black men and white women.

When black women question this disparity in representation, responses range from "we can't find them" to what may be called the "two-steps behind" syndrome. No black has ever accepted the "we can't find them" response. Black men, when seriously sought, have been found, encouraged, and promoted. In some cases, they have multiplied so rapidly, one begins to think twice about denouncing spontaneous generation. Everyone now knows that when an institution is seriously recruiting in a framework of (budgetary) reward and punishment, its minority deficiencies can easily be repaired. Obviously, no serious efforts have been made until very recently and on a very limited scale to recruit or promote black women to important staff, faculty, or administrative positions in institutions of higher learning. If these institutions are to pursue an equitable policy that will not result in the demoralization of any of their constituency, *they must recruit and promote black women at the same rate and in the same proportions as black men in all areas of the academic structure.*

Another objection often raised that is even more disturbing is the "two-steps behind" philosophy, which militates against equal benefits for black women on the fallacious assumption that discrimination has had far more serious repercussions for black men than for black women: black women must now take a back seat to the black man as he "catches up." I have received such remarks and they seem to be fairly common even now. One writer rebuts it candidly:

> It must be pointed out at this time, that black women are not resentful of the rise to power of black men. We welcome it. We see in it the eventual liberation of all black people from this oppressive system of capitalism. Nevertheless, this does not mean that you have to negate one for the other. This kind of thinking is a product of miseducation; that it's either X or it's Y. It is fallacious reasoning that in order for the black man to be strong, the black woman has to be weak. Those who are exerting their "manhood" by telling black women to step back into a submissive role are assuming a counter-revolutionary position. Black women likewise have been abused by the system and we must begin talking about the elimination of all kinds of oppression (Beal 1970:343-344).

Black women have grown sensitive to this discrimination within discrimination, but their protests have not yet been translated into affirmative action on their own behalf. The black woman is told that black man has fared far worse from racial discrimination than she has; that when black men could find no work at all, she could always be a maid for "Miss Ann" or find some employment with "Mr. Charlie." Recent studies show that such arguments are based on false assumptions and incorrect data (Wright 1972:13-15). One would be hard pressed to say which is the more demoralizing circumstance: unemployment or servitude. The black woman will never rediscover *her* pride and *her* identity by learning to be second class a second time. Universities, black and white, must take these issues into serious consideration if the ultimate goals of *human* freedom and equal opportunities are to be reached.

BLACK WOMEN'S LIBERATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

The rise of women's liberation and the protests of Third World women in the late 1960s and early 1970s provided another framework in which black women could evaluate their relationship to black men and white women. From the outset, the women's liberation movement, at least philosophically, has sought to embrace and speak to the concerns of all women. This in itself is an impossible task because of the infinite complexity and variety of women in this country. As a goal, it represents the true cross-cultural and cross-racial orientation which was and is the basic unifying force in the movement. The danger in such an ideal arises when individu-

als or groups attempt to put it into practice without first dealing with its implicit assumptions. With regard to black women, for example, the women's movement has attempted to transcend rather than confront the racial tensions and the complexities resulting from the black woman's involvement in the movement. I have sat through meeting after meeting in which after a black woman raises objections to certain of the movement's directions and orientations, the inevitable "reverential silence" sets in and then the discussion simply proceeds as before. Promises are often made to study the situation of the black woman and she is reassured that the movement has her interests at heart because "she is a woman." *But black women are different from white women.* Their situation is more than a parenthetical remark in a chapter which supposedly includes them.

Black women understandably have mixed feelings about women's liberation. At first glance, the women's movement casts an all-too-familiar picture. The black woman finds herself in a special category in yet another white-dominated group — a division that in many ways mirrors society as a whole and toward which she has some deep-seated hostility. Many black women feel that the life experiences and life styles of white women in the movement are dramatically different from theirs.

> Another major differentiation is that the white women's movement is basically middle class. Very few of these women suffer the extreme economic exploitation that most black women are subjected to day by day. It is not an intellectual persecution alone; it is not an intellectual outburst for us; it is quite real (Beal 1970:350-351).

Statistics bear out this point: 50 percent of all black women work in contrast to 42 percent of all white women, and black women work in lower-status jobs and at lower pay than white women. These facts account in part for black women's view of work as more of a necessity than an "opportunity," and that in turn may contribute to the misunderstandings and disagreements between black and white women.

The black woman sees that her numbers are few among the general membership of the women's movement, and nonexistent among its national leadership. She often is told that many of the problems she raises are problems of all blacks and, as such, are not the special concern of the women's movement. Why, for example, should a new women's studies center with limited funds finance course offerings on black women when there is already a black studies center or department? Can academic issues affecting black women even legitimately be separated from those affecting her race? These important questions and their implications have gone unanswered for the most part or relegated to black women to work out themselves.

A black woman's view of teaching methods and scholarship will also be different from those of her white counterpart. My own academic training has been in Classics and I have found, for example, that black women students, much more than white women students, understand and can identify with the situation of Medea. When the chorus agrees that the plight of *all* women is dismal, Medea makes some distinctions that are intrinsic to grasping one of the central issues of the play.

> Surely, of all creatures that have life and will, we
> Women are the most wretched.
> Still more, a foreign woman, coming among new laws,
> New customs, needs the skill of magic, to find out what
> Her home could not teach her...
>
> But the same arguments do not apply to you and me.
> You have this city, your father's home, the enjoyment of
> Your life, and your friend's company. I am alone, I

Have no city; now my husband insults me. I was taken as
Plunder from a land at the earth's edge. I have no
Mother, brother, nor any of my own blood to turn to in
This extremity (Euripides 1964:24-25).

The black woman in higher education is not unlike Medea. She is inexperienced in the system, just as most of her peers and family have traditionally been excluded from it. Black even more than white women need "magic," that is, superior ability, in order to receive equal opportunities.

Prior to my experience with the Chancellor's Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities at the University of Pittsburgh and my experience and involvement with the women's movement, I had unquestioningly accepted what I conceived to be the black woman's role. I functioned by the tacit formulae followed by all black women who wish to succeed in a man's (both black and white) world:

You must be *better qualified* than the men.
You must be *more articulate*.
You must be *more aggressive*.
You must have *more stamina* to face inevitable setbacks.
You must have *more patience*, since you will advance *more slowly*.
Above all, you must remain *feminine* and *not appear threatening*.

I have found that black women share these dicta with white women. However, black women have an extra step in the syllogism which white women do not have, that is, *they must also be better than white women*. It is this seldom discussed fact which has generated bitterness toward white women in general. In a power ladder, the white woman is seen to be two steps removed from the power, but the black woman is three steps removed. The black woman cannot help being cautious in allying herself with a "privileged competitor."

Recognizing these similarities and differences, the black woman's experience could add richness and depth to many areas of higher education. In a women's studies curriculum, for example, the black woman's experience should be depicted and studied in contrast to the white woman's experience, for the benefit and growth of both black and white students. This approach would also increase the involvement of black women faculty in such programs. Iris Murdoch's book *The Time of the Angels* is an example of a starting point for such a venture. Pattie O'Driscoll symbolizes the experience of many young black women who, surrounded by white women and men in academe, find themselves in a unique and dehumanizing situation. Her situation is poignantly summarized: "[A]s a child she had not distinguished between the affliction of being coloured and the affliction of being Pattie...whiteness seemed to join all the white people together in a cozy union, but blackness divided the black, each into the loneliness of his own special hue" (Murdoch 1971:22-23).

Among the faculty and administrative ranks, black women face even more complex problems. Institutions have responded initially to the women's movement with twice the "deliberate speed" with which they responded to the black movement, for white women are far more numerous in faculty and administrative positions than are either minority men or women. Institutions often have met the double threat of the black and the women's movements by pitting the two groups against each other. Everyone who has worked in compliance and affirmative action programs knows that this is a favorite institutional ploy. Blacks and women often are lumped together in the competition for the same famous "slice of the pie," the same positions, and the same benefits. This ploy, in a period of financial crisis

heightened by the pronouncements and activities of HEW, has caused new tensions and rivalries to arise. I do not know how many times I have gone to meetings on women's opportunities and institutional change where I have heard avuncular remarks to the effect that women would have to be patient since so much money had to be spent on providing more opportunities for minority candidates. I then hear the same administrators admonishing black groups to be patient since the women were using up so much money. The ploy evidently works, for I know of no institution where the women's groups and black groups have publicly allied to put an end to such divisive tactics; and I know of no institution where *significant* gains have been made for both white women and minority women and men. A bridge between these two groups is sorely needed for the benefit of both.

Caught between the claims of the women's movement and the black movement, the black women is being sorely pressed to define her political allegiances. While she has learned that involvement in the black movement has not led to a significant advancement of black women, strategically her association with the women's movement places her in an extremely awkward position and often damages her credibility among her black friends and colleagues. I have often been criticized for "deserting" the black cause and lessening the chances for black advancement in working for the causes of women. Yet, once in the women's movement, I find that many of my concerns and different needs are ignored, overlooked, or rarely discussed due to the powerful myth of an all-embracing sisterhood.

Some black women who have struggled with these conflicts have decided that the only solution is secession from both movements in favor of a third group exclusively devoted to the concerns of black women. This route seems to ensure "purity," pride, identity, clarity in issues, and solidarity; but strategically it is the one most fraught with peril. By its aloof stance, a third movement is, in effect, disavowing both the women's movement and the black movement. Unwittingly, it turns these other movements into unnatural enemies. Black women in this isolated position have forced themselves into a whole system of moves and countermoves which cannot fail to damage the other movements; at the same time, they invite institutional attempts to "slice the pie" yet a third way. My objection to this alternative is not ideological, nor am I suggesting malintent on the part of these women. I share their frustration and their impatience. But I have seen the resentment and fear engendered within and by these women faced with a dilemma, constantly at cross-purposes with themselves and others, as they stand alone to fight for what no one else will fight for quite hard enough.

Just as in some African myths of creation, the black woman has been called upon to create herself without model or precedent. She has had enough experience to know that, unless it changes, she can never comfortably or confidently fit into the white-oriented women's movement. At the same time, she has been held back, overlooked, and chided enough to know that all of her problems cannot be answered in the male-oriented black movement. She has had enough experience with institutional behavior and strategy to know that a third interest group (at least at this time) is lethal to the movements which, to a certain extent, have her concerns at heart.

There seems to be only one feasible course, one productive but difficult and lonely road, if the black woman is to achieve concrete benefits at the end of her struggle. She must be the gadfly who stings both movements into achieving their goals — prodding the women's movement into confronting its racism and working doubly hard for the concerns of black women;

and prodding the less volatile black movement into confronting its inherent sexism and righting the injustice it has done to black women. The black woman must work doubly hard in both movements; she must become the sorely needed bridge between them if their goals are to be translated into reality. The two movements must become "company" in affirmative action in order for the goal of human rights in higher education to become a reality.

REFERENCES

American Council of Education, 1971. The American freshman: National norms for fall 1971. 6(6), Washington, D.C.: Author.

Beal, Frances M. 1970. Double jeopardy: To be black and female. In Robin Morgan (Ed.), *Sisterhood is powerful*. New York: Vintage Books, pp. 340-353.

Euripides. 1964. *Medea*. New York: Penguin Books.

Jackson, Jacqueline J. 1972a. Black women and higher education. Mimeographed.

Jackson, Jacqueline J. 1972b. Where are the black men? *Ebony*, 27:99-106.

Ladner, Joyce. 1971. *Tomorrow's tomorrow—The black woman*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co.

Murdoch, Iris. 1971. *The time of the angels*. New York: Bard Books.

Noble, Jeanne. 1956. *The Negro woman's college education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1964. *U.S. census of population: 1960 characteristics of the population*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Willie, Charles, and Levy, Joan. 1972. Black is lonely. *Psychology Today*, 5 (10): 50-80.

Wright, Doris. 1972. On black womanhood. *The Second Wave*, 1 (4):13-15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Drake, St. Clair. 1971. The black university in the American social order. *Daedalus, 100(3),.833-897*.

Dubois, W. E. B. (Ed.). 1969. *The Negro American family*. New York: New American Library.

Feig, Konnilyn. 1972. Myths of female liberation. University of Pittsburgh.Mimeographed.

Ferris, A. 1971. *Indicators of trends in the status of American women*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Miller, Albert H. 1971. The problems of the minority student on the campus. *Liberal Education*, 55:18-23.

Slaughter, Diane T. 1972. Bec ming an Afro-American woman. *School Review*, 80(2):299-317.

Men in Organizations: Some Reflections

Herbert A. Shepard

The second piece of advice is: Observe the cormorant in the fishing fleet. You know how cormorants are used for fishing. The technique involves a man in a rowboat with about half a dozen or so cormorants, each with a ring around the neck. As the bird spots a fish, it would dive into the water and unerringly come up with it. Because of the ring, the larger fish are not swallowed but held in the throat. The fisherman picks up the bird and squeezes out the fish through the mouth. The bird then dives for another and the cycle repeats itself.

To come back to the second piece of advice from the new-Taoist to the American worker. Observe the cormorant, he would say. Why is it that of all the different animals, the cormorant has been chosen to slave away day and night for the fisherman? Were the bird not greedy for fish, or not efficient in catching it, or not readily trained, would society have created an industry to exploit the bird? Would the ingenious device of a ring around its neck, and the simple procedure of squeezing the bird's neck to force it to regurgitate the fish, have been devised? Of course not.

Greed, talent, and capacity for learning,then,are the basis of exploitation. The more you are able to moderate and/or hide them from society, the greater will be your chances of escaping the fate of the cormorant.

...It is necessary to remember that the institutions of society are geared to make society prosper, not necessarily to minimizing suffering on your part. It is for this reason, among others, that the schools tend to drum it into your mind the high desirability of those characteristics that tend to make society prosper — namely, ambition, progress and success. These in turn are to be valued in terms of society's objectives. All of them gradually but surely increase your greed and make a cormorant out of you.[1]

SOME HISTORY ABOUT MEN IN ORGANIZATIONS

Among the other spectacular, violent, and possibly catastrophic developments in America in the twentieth century was the emergence of a new breed of men: the managers. Managers are the focus of this chapter, because they are the men who have been successful in organizations. Our society has learned how to produce managers by the millions. The childrearing and schooling practices needed for the production of farmers were modified to produce managers. The school became a socializing model of the adult bureaucracy. Fathers increased their emphasis on filial obedience and conformity to formal rules within the home and community, prolonged their sons' dependency on the parent's ability to provide, demanded that the son engage in win-lose competitiveness with peers outside the home, that he earn straight A's across the board in school, and that he deny any confused feelings stirred by these anomalous requirements. Of the schooling provided to the boys as the country moved to the city and the one-room, multi-age schoolhouse became the depersonalizing cell-block of concrete, vinyl and glass hallways, washrooms and peer-group classrooms, it could be said that any lad who could survive it through high school without dropping out would survive adult organizations as well. The school provided an adequate experience in pleasing authorities, competing with one's peers, working on intrinsically meaningless tasks, and

Reproduced by permission from BEYOND SEX ROLES by Alice Sargent, Copyright © 1977, West Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

[1] Ralph G. H. Siu. Work and Serenity, *Journal of Occupational Mental Health*, 1971, 1(1), 5.

associating feelings of success and failure — self-worth and self-worthlessness — with status symbols in the form of grades. Cormorants notwithstanding, the proudest thing a father could say was that his son was ambitious, talented, and had a high capacity for learning.

During most of the period of urbanization, industrialization, professionalization and bureaucratization, the church, as well as home and school, played an important role in preparing men for organizations. By rewarding conformity and obedience, by inducing guilt and a sense of sin for deviance, and by stressing the necessity for loyalty to a supreme authority, the church helped lay a foundation for organizational discipline. Loyalty was readily transferable to other authorities — the boss, the mission, the nation, the corporation or the chief. Even the church's geographical heritage in the positioning of heaven and hell supported the notion of up and down in social life, identifying hierachy with pyramid — a metaphor that is perhaps our most pervasive myth.

Some of the religions also provided a simple model of traditional bureaucratic organization. But in this respect, the military tradition had much greater impact. For as technology and organization grew symbiotically, we experienced a series of wars, some very large and involving many of our young men. In numerous ways military experience facilitated mastery of the art of being a superior and a subordinate, served to teach and reinforce the mentality and skills needed in large organizations, and provided a language suitable for use in an expanding, competitive organization: mission, strategy and tactics, mobilization and deployment. Much military slang became the slang of civilian organization: the top brass or the big guns on the one hand, the troops on the other. Managers learned to be hardnosed and to bite the bullet.

Standards of managerial appearance were also reinforced by military experience. Beards and long hair are dysfunctional when dealing with wounds, mud, lice, and dangerous equipment. A heritage of the wars seems to have been a norm that having a face as hairless as a woman's and hair almost as short as a convict's was an important symbol of masculinity and managerial respectability. In matters of dress, the limits of what constitutes proper managerial clothing became narrow, clear and somber — in some organizations, almost uniform.

The experience of managers in organizations coupled with the work of social scientists and engineers heightened our awareness of and created concepts for organizational structure and process. Early in the period, concepts like authority, delegation, responsibility, span of control, line and staff, supervision and efficiency became fundamental principles. Some of the principles could be summed up in phrases like one man — one boss; no responsibility without commensurate authority. On such fundamentals more complex and refined policies, procedures and practices were erected. Organization charting and the writing of job descriptions became identifiable arts. Compensation and industrial engineering became professional fields. Management information and control systems became more sophisticated. The growth of technology and the image of the organization as a command system encouraged the use of mechanistic concepts. An organization was like an automatic factory in which some functions could not yet be economically mechanized, and were therefore performed by human parts operating to specification.

The impact of all these intertwined forces and processes was to produce an adult male who was dedicated to the disciplined performance of his organizational role, and who was capable of subordinating himself for the purpose of moving upward, that is, of subordinating himself at a higher

level. In doing so, he also subordinated any personal needs that were irrelevant to the organization. As one manager put it, "Your work day is to earn your salary; your overtime is to gain your promotion." This depersonalization with respect to work extended to interpersonal communication. Articulate, rational, fact-based, cause-effect discourse was a critical success skill. Interaction with the boss should be businesslike. Subordinates were to be directed and evaluated. Issues among peers should be resolved by the boss.

Relationships with subordinates were to be impersonal — firm but fair. Should a subordinate have to be "terminated," an impersonal relationship would make the action less awkward or painful. The psychological power of the organization over the man is suggested in the last statement. Success could never be securely and permanently acquired. There were always higher levels to aspire to; but the people at higher levels had the power to offer not only a little more success, but also complete failure — a traumatic blow to self-esteem.

If men experienced the anxiety generated by this threat, they were not to show it. The emphasis on rational communication and decision making meant that all emotion was considered dysfunctional; and careers could be damaged by a show of feelings, especially the warmer emotions. In spite of what was known about "positive reinforcement," it was rarely used as a managerial method: more attention was paid to the punishment of unwanted behaviors than to the reinforcement of wanted behaviors. Supportive behavior of any kind was rare; admitting a need for help from others was a sign of weakness; offering help was a putdown.

Organizational disciplines and symbols came to pervade the life of the manager. Automobiles, homes, and tastes conformed to the requirements of organizational role and status almost as much as office size and furnishings. The manner and content of greeting other men, engaging in small talk, and joking became ritualized and differentiated at and between different levels of organization, in the same way that communication around tasks or the making of formal presentations conformed to certain standards.

The above historical sketch highlights some aspects of male socialization and organization development to the neglect of others, and perhaps to the point of caricature. Though no precise dates can be ascribed to the oversimplified description given above, it is intended to suggest the early 1950s. In succeeding years the demands of organization on men and of men on organization have begun to shift dramatically, and this shift is affecting male roles and relationships, and also changing the characteristics of female roles in organizations.[2]

The impact of these historical developments on domestic life over a period of a few generations was dramatic. As the roles of men became more status-oriented, more performance-oriented, more oriented toward organization-

[2] Historically, the roles of women in organizations are relevant to the focus of this chapter largely because women came to replace men as adjuncts to managers. Girls were not brought up to aspire to compete in organizations. In fact, girls who excelled in school or were active, competitive tomboys after school, like girls who appeared to have the female equivalent of wild oats to sow, were a source of concern to parents and teachers. Learning to provide the support system that a man needed — to be decorative, emotionally supportive, and competent in support tasks like housekeeping and childrearing — these were the important things. During this period the male confidential clerk disappeared from organizations. In military organizations male aides began to be replaced by members of the women's services. These support jobs came to be seen as somewhat demeaning for men, and it seemed appropriate to have women in roles analogous in their supportive characteristics to the wifely role.

al success, less personally expressive, and more disciplined — with all the attendant qualities of orderliness, rationality, articulateness, neatness, efficiency, punctuality, conformity, and structure — the demands on household organization became more stringent. (It was during these years that the pressure-cooker became popular.) When money and status became important measures of male success, there was increased emphasis on the husband — father's role as provider of these commodities to his family, and de-emphasis on emotional support and interpersonal relations. As his discipline and dedication to work increased, his wife seemed to develop excellence in housekeeping, the management of children, the art of being a hostess and decorative companion, and in maintaining the family image. At the same time, the nuclear family became more isolated from external sources of emotional support. Moving up in the organization meant moving around the country. Bonds of kinship, friendship, and familiarity became superficial and transitory. The family became an impoverished social system, a prison in which the children had only two significant adults to turn to, and the adults had only each other. Families broke up at an increasing rate, leaving bewildered men, bitter women, and children in conflict.

During the fifties, conditions were ripening for radical change in family life, sex roles, human values, and organizations. The theme of human relations had been of concern to management for some time, but primarily with respect to the work force. The spread of unionism was in part a response to the dehumanization of work and workers, but the human relations movement was intended more as a counterforce to unionism than as an effort to make the job worthwhile.

During the forties and fifties there was increasing awareness of the inadequate bureaucratic principles governing organizational structure and process. As organizations grew larger and more complex, internal interdependencies could no longer be managed by the clumsy hierarchy of authority-responsibility delegations; for example, teamwork and collaboration among specialists and managers was needed for the solution of complicated problems. And as organizational environments became more dynamic, the awkward communication and decision-making processes of traditional firms prevented them from making a rapid, adaptive response to external changes. Not only were organizations becoming unfit to work in, they were becoming unfit to work.

During this period, various organizational experiments were undertaken. The "Scanlon Plan" in which participants in interpersonal and intergroup collaboration were rewarded was one such experiment. National Training Laboratories began to offer interpersonal-relations training for executives. A naval laboratory began to hold periodic "retreats" for its management to resolve interpersonal conflicts and develop teamwork among the members. The first major organization-development experiments were conducted at Esso Standard Oil in the late fifties.

All these experiments emphasized the need for collaboration, teamwork, openness, trust, and the expression and use of emotion. People began to recognize that organizations had to become less mechanistic and more organic if they were to be effective: the parts of any thriving organism are fully alive and in good communication with one another and actively in touch with internal and external environments. There were radical implications for how men and women would perform their organizational roles. In the sixties, TRW Systems, a leader in the aerospace industry, was also a leader in developing new concepts of organization (matrix organization) and in developing resocializing methods (organization development) for its

members. Matrix organization dispensed with the one-man-one-boss rule, required that responsibility and authority be shared by people rather than divided among them, and relied on teamwork within and between many groups of specialists for organizational effectiveness. Organization development provided members with opportunities to learn how to build relationships with one another that would permit the organization to function. These were "rehumanizing" experiences that emphasized personal growth, interpersonal openness, reaching out to others to confront conflict, or to seek or offer help. Such learnings were out of keeping with traditional concepts of organizational role or masculine role — forerunners of the learnings that were to become more widespread in the seventies.

SOME CURRENT HISTORY ABOUT MEN IN ORGANIZATIONS

It is not possible to have a perspective on the multifaceted crunch we are now entering, but some observations can be offered on recent developments related to the topic of this chapter — men in organizations.

The day of the simple hierarchy, chain of command, or bureaucracy has passed, and with it the relevance and utility of many of the disciplines, concepts, and skills that men in organizations learned. Some of the "fundamentals" are applicable in specific contexts, but they have moved from a position of absolute value to one of relative value. The increasing complexity of internal and external interdependencies and the increasingly turbulent environment make unprecedented demands on managers. The socializing institutions of family, school, and church have not kept pace with the requirements of organization in the adult world. Organizations are becoming resocializing institutions, providing intensive continuing education to their members.

A transformation of values accompanies the acquisition of new organizational skills. Competition among individuals has become dysfunctional where problem solving and the achievement of organizational objectives require intense collaboration and commitment to each other's success. Intense collaboration requires more than the learning of some new skills. It requires learning how to earn trust and how to extend it to others; it requires personalization rather than depersonalization of relationships; it means giving emotional as well as technical support to others; it involves learning to confront conflict with others and to resolve conflicts on a win-win basis; it requires the ability to learn from and with others; it requires a willingness to transcend the boundaries of one's own and others' job descriptions; it requires learning how to use each other's resources strategically in the accomplishment of shared objectives. All these learnings imply a change in life values from those implicit in the older concepts of organization.

Control is still the central concern of the manager. In the past, control was associated with aggressiveness and domination as an aspect of male sexism. Under the emerging organizational conditions, these attributes are likely to be dysfunctional. Controlling has become a dynamic, adaptive, learning process, an aspect of organizational communication depending on openness, responsiveness and trust, on the one hand, and on the capacity to process large amounts of complex information, on the other. Controlling means continuously seeking a strategic comprehension of complicated processes.

Similarly, authority and obedience are no longer the cement of organization, just as money and status are no longer adequate as motivators. There is no unitary authority over the multiple resources involved in the accomplishment of organizational goals, nor can there be. Men in organizations must learn a broad range of influence skills besides those of com-

mand, persuasion, manipulation, and negotiation. They must learn a whole range of collaborative influence strategies for which there is little historical precedent: how to create common interests, how to resolve conflict on a win-win or superordinate goal basis, how to build on one another's strengths.

In the area of motivation, psychic income is becoming as important as money and more important than status. As organizations begin to demand the full range of human potential, the educational processes involved cause a continuous raising of levels of awareness. A new kind of selfishness is emerging from the resocialization experiences that organizations are providing for their members; for example, Gestalt Therapy, Transactional Awareness, Transcendental Meditation, Life Planning, Conflict Management, Personal Growth, Team Development, Intercultural Skills, Achievement and Power Motivation, Creativity, Awareness Training, Consciousness Expansion. Many of these experiences have certain themes and implications in common: learning to care for and nurture oneself; learning to recognize and accept responsibility for one's choices rather than projecting them onto others; learning to appreciate the right side of the brain and develop latent capacities that were regarded as irrational and dysfunctional (and effeminate!) in organizations — like intuition, nonverbal imagery, empathic apprehension of others, the existence of auras, extrasensory perception, and energy exchange among people; re-examining one's fundamental preconceptions about oneself, about the meaning of life, about religious, social and moral values and behavior, about war, progress, government and nationalism, about the roles of women and men, about sex and race, childhood, youth, adulthood and old age, and about organizational life.

It would be folly to claim that these developments have as yet brought about a revolution in men's values or organizational life or family relationships or relationships with women. Most managers still feel guilty if they leave the office early; most managers continue to play variations of the games they learned in college to impress the professor at the expense of their fellow students; most managers are still seeking money and status in the shadow of the fear of failure rather than seeking beauty in life and work; most managers still want their children to be good status symbols; most managers still want to think of themselves as good providers for their wives and other dependents. And as all the above implies, most managers are men.

But men are changing, and by no means solely in response to changing women. Many women are adjusted to the man-manager of the past and are alarmed as he becomes more human; many women have rebelled against the man-manager of the past and are striving to become like him. But current and future organizational requirements demand a higher level of human functioning. Organizations need both men and women who are developing and using all their multifaceted potentials.

Women and the Structure of Organizations: Explorations in Theory and Behavior

Rosabeth Moss Kanter

This is an "organizational" society. The lives of very few of us are untouched by the growth and power of large, complex organizations in the twentieth century. The consequences of decisions made in these organizations, particularly business enterprises, may affect the availability of goods and services, the distribution of wealth and privilege, and the opportunity for meaningful work. The distribution of functions within organizations affects the quality of daily life for a large proportion of working Americans: their opportunities for growth and self-expression, for good or poor health, as well as their daily social contacts. The distribution of power within organizations affects who benefits, and to what degree, from the things organizations make possible, and whose interests are served by the organization's decisions. Despite a prevalent image in social science of modern organizations as universalistic, sex-neutral tools, sex is a very important determinant of who gets what in and out of organizations.

The ways in which women have been connected to organizations and have operated within them, and whether these ways differ from those of men, have been underinvestigated in social research. While there is a relatively large and growing literature that documents the degree to which women are socialized to perform different kinds of activities from men (often activities with less power and monetary reward), there has been less attention paid to the patterned relationships between women and men in organizations.

This chapter is an attempt to define directions for an enlarged understanding of the sociology of organizations as it concerns women, and of the study of women as it contributes to a more comprehensive and accurate sociology of organizations. The focus throughout is solely on the United States and largely on the administrative levels of business organizations. In part, this was an attempt to place limits on an area with a vast amount of literature. But it is also because the administrative issues of business tended to provide the impetus for the early sociology of organizations. Business organizations, additionally, have great power in American society and, because they are successful, are assumed to be successfully managed, so that their organization and management has often served as a model for other systems. It is also in business organizations that women seem most conspicuously absent from positions of prestige and power.

MANAGEMENT: A MALE CATEGORY

Women generally do not hold positions of power and authority in organizations, especially in American industry. Those few women in management tend to be concentrated in lower-paying positions, in selected fields, in staff rather than line positions, and in less powerful, less prestigious organizations. In 1969, U.S. Census figures indicate that women constituted only 3.25 per cent of the managers and administrators earning over $15,000 per year (before taxes), and 2.26 per cent of those earning over $30,000 per year. Women themselves may make the choice not to compete

"Women and the Structure of Organizations: Explorations in Theory and Behavior" by Rosabeth Moss Kanter from the book Another Voice *by Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter. Copyright © 1975 by Sociological Inquiry. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc.*

for managerial positions. Educated women, for example, tend not to enter fields that are linked to, and are preparation for, management. A substantially higher proportion of female college graduates than male become "professional, technical, and kindred" workers rather than managers and administrators, for instance (77.4 per cent as opposed to 58.9 per cent — Bureau of the Census, 1973a). Women with doctorates generally do not take them in management-related fields, as figures on earned doctorates in the United States between 1960 and 1969 indicate.[1] At least a portion of the evidence that women earn less than men can be accounted for by the fact that women hold jobs carrying less pay even in well-paid fields like management. Bureau of Labor Statistics figures indicate that in 1970 the median annual earnings of female managers and administrators (excluding farm administration) were around half of that for men, even in fields such as school administration and wholesale/retail trade, where female administrators are clustered. A recent national personnel survey of 163 U.S. companies discovered that the farther up the management ladder, even scarcer are the women. In over half of the companies, women held only 2 per cent or less of the first-level supervisory jobs (including such positions as manager of secretaries); in *three-quarters* of the companies, women held 2 per cent or fewer of the middle-management jobs; and in *over three-quarters* of the companies, they held *none* of the top-management jobs (*Personnel Policies Forum*, 1971).

The few management women are also clustered in particular kinds of organizations. The *Personnel Policies Forum* survey found that women were proportionately more represented in management in nonbusiness rather than in business organizations, and, within business, in nonmanufacturing rather than in manufacturing enterprises. A 1965 *Harvard Business Review* survey of 1,000 male and 900 female executives (the men were drawn from the *HBR* readership, but there were so few women among top executives that separate lists had to be used to locate them) found women disproportionately represented in the management of retail/wholesale trade (merchandising fields) and advertising, whereas men were disproportionately represented in the management of banking/investment/insurance companies (financial concerns) and industrial goods manufacturing (Bowman, Worthy, and Greyser, 1965). (Calculations based on 1969 U. S. Census figures confirm the clustering of women managers in retail trade and services, including stenographic services, and men in manufacturing.[2]) The *HBR* respondents, further, felt that opportunities for women in management lie only in: education, the arts, social services, retail trade, office management, personnel work, and nonmanagement positions. One-third of the respondents felt, as of 1965, that there were *no* opportunities for women in the management of labor unions; construction, mining, and oil companies; industrial goods manufacturing; production; and top management in general (Bowman, Worthy, and Greyser, 1965). The *HBR* survey is also suggestive of the concentration of women in staff positions, where they tend not to have authority over subordinates, or in low-status areas. Women in the *HBR* study were heavily represented in marketing and office management (39 per cent and 10 per cent of the female respondents, respectively, as opposed to 16 per cent and 3 per cent of the males, respectively) and underrepresented in general management (10 per cent of the women, compared with 40 per cent of the men falling into this category). Similarly, the women were disproportionately found in small (and hence less powerful or statusful) organizations.

These data suggest that women are virtually absent from the management of large industrial enterprises and present to only a slightly greater degree in the management of retail or business-support service organizations.

Even in areas in which the workers are likely to be female, their managers are likely to be male. The number of male and of female bank tellers in the United States in 1969 was nearly equal, for example (255,549 men and 220,255 women), but "bank officers and financial managers" were largely male (82.48 per cent male and 17.52 per cent female). Office workers are largely female, yet office *managers*, a relatively low-status management position, are still more likely to be male than female (59.64 per cent male, 40.36 per cent female) (calculations based on figures of Bureau of the Census, 1973a).

We need to know the barriers to women in organizational leadership and also what difference their presence makes: how culture and behavior are shaped by the sex distribution of managers. The behavior and experiences of the few women in management and leadership positions should be considered as a function of membership in male-dominated settings. (Some of the findings of the few studies done to date are reported later.) The politics and informal networks of management as influenced by its male membership should be further studied — e.g., the degree to which managerial as well as worker behavior and culture is shaped in part by the traditions, emotions, and sentiments of male groups.[3] How the culture and behavior of management is affected by (or reflected in) the sex ratio of managers is also important (e.g., how retail or service organizations differ from manufacturers), as well as the influence of the sex composition of management on its relations with other organizational strata.

OFFICE WORK: FEMALE FUNCTION

Women are to clerical labor as men are to management. According to Census Bureau data, there were over 10 million female "clerical and kindred workers" in the United States in 1969, 73.78 per cent of the total employed workers in this category. Men in the clerical labor force tend to be concentrated in a few, physically oriented occupations where they far outnumber women (computer operators, messengers, mail carriers, shipping and receiving clerks, and stock clerks). The rest of the occupations, the core of office work, are heavily female. Women comprised 82.14 per cent of the bookkeepers, 81.84 per cent of the billing clerks, 68.96 per cent of the payroll and timekeeping clerks, and 82.08 per cent of the file clerks. In secretarial and related functions, men are as underrepresented as women are in management. Women comprised 93.46 per cent of the stenographers in 1969, 94.18 per cent of the typists, 94.65 per cent of the receptionists, and 97.71 per cent of the secretaries. In fact, these four positions account for nearly 40 per cent of the 1969 female "clerical and kindred workers"; secretaries alone account for 25 per cent of the 1969 female clerical labor force (calculations based on Bureau of the Census, 1973a). Labor Bureau statistics for 1970, calculated on a slightly different basis, show even fewer men in such positions: of the category "stenographers, typists, and secretaries," 98.6 per cent are female and only 1.40 per cent are male (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1971). *Work in America* (1972), a task force report to HEW, has concluded that the job of secretary is symbolic of the status of female employment, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Office jobs for women have low status, little autonomy or opportunity for growth, and generally low pay.

Women did not always dominate the clerical labor force; office work in the nineteenth century was first a male job. The same turn-of-the-century period (1890-1910) that brought large organizations and the growth of the professional manager also witnessed the emergence of the modern office, with its invention of new roles for women. The three-person office of mid-nineteenth-century Dickens novels was socially reorganized into departments and functional areas headed by office managers, and this

change — itself a product of bureaucraticization and machine technology — permitted the massive introduction of office machines. Though invented in the 1870s, the typewriter was not widely used until the twentieth century; but from 1900-20, office employment rose dramatically, and typing soon became women's work (Mills, 1951:192-93).

The rise in the employment of women in the office around the turn of the century was dramatic, and it corresponded to a large decrease in "household occupations" (servants, dressmakers and seamstresses outside of factories, and laundresses). In 1870 the "clerical group" (clerks, stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, cashiers, and accountants) accounted for less than 1 per cent of the women employed outside of agriculture; by 1920 it accounted for over 25 per cent of female nonagricultural employment (Hill, 1929:39). In 1880 the proportion of women in the clerical labor force as a whole was 4 per cent; in 1890, 21 per cent (Davies, 1974). By 1910, women were already 83.2 per cent of the stenographers and typists; by 1920, they were 91.8 per cent of the stenographers/typists and 48.8 per cent of the bookkeepers, cashiers, and accountants (Hill, 1929:56-57). Between 1910 and 1920 the number of female clerks (excluding store clerks) quadrupled; female stenographers and typists more than doubled (Hill, 1929:33). Slightly more women were still employed in factory than in clerical jobs in 1920 (about 1.8 million and 1.5 million, respectively), but less than 1 per cent of those in industry could be classified as managers, superintendents, or officials (calculations based on Hill, 1929: Table 115). The growth of modern administration brought women into domination in the office but absent in management. Whereas factory jobs were divided between men and women (though often sex-typed), clerical jobs rapidly became the work almost exclusively of women.

To what extent was the nature of office work and the structural position of office workers in organizations shaped by the "feminization" of the clerical labor force? Did the nature of this organizational status come to be defined in sex-role-appropriate terms,[4] and did the emergent relations between office work and the management for which it was done reinforce the female caste of the former and the masculine caste of the latter? Did the sexual stratification of these two organizational categories constitute a barrier to mobility between them? Sociologists have tended to neglect these questions. Studies of the history of the office, the social relations it entailed, and the structural relations between and within categories of clerical and managerial personnel have generally not been included in studies of modern organizations (Miller, 1950:303; Crozier, 1965:15). (The few pioneering studies include C. Wright Mills' *White Collar* [1951], Nancy Morse [1953] on job satisfaction of white-collar workers, and Michel Crozier [1965] on Parisian insurance office workers. Margery Davies' work in progress [1974] considers the social implications of the feminization of the clerical labor force.)[5]

The secretary may be a prototypical and pivotal role to examine; research should consider the place of this job in the clerical hierarchy, its relations to management, and whether its role demands bar women from moving into management positions. Even though private secretaries represent only a small proportion of the female clerical labor force, this position is sometimes the highest to which a woman office worker may aspire — the best paid, most prestigious, and for secretaries of executives, one with "reflected power" derived from the status of the manager. It is also the job in which there are the most clearly defined male-female relations — the private secretary has been called an "office wife" (Mills, 1951; Bernard, 1971).[6] My field work in a large New York-based corporation indicates

59

that the traditional secretary-manager relationship has striking parallels to Weber's definition of "patrimonial rule" (Bendix, 1960:425), even though this relationship occurs within organizations that social scientists have assumed generally fit Weber's "bureaucratic" model. The relationship can be defined as "patrimonial" to the extent that managers make demands at their own discretion and arbitrarily recruit secretaries on the basis of appearance, personality, and other subjective factors rather than on skill, expect personal service, exact loyalty, and make secretaries part of their private retinue (e.g., expecting them to move when they move). Further, secretaries in many large organizations may derive their status from that of their boss, regardless of the work they do; a promotion for a secretary may mean moving on to a higher-status manager, whether or not her work changes or improves.[7] There may be no job descriptions, as there are for managerial positions, that help match the person's skills to the job or insure some uniformity of demands across jobs, so that there are often no safeguards to exploitation, no standards for promotion other than personal relationships, and no way of determining if a secretary can be moved to another job (all barriers to mobility out of the secretarial ranks for women).[8] The relation of the secretarial work force to management may be one of status in addition to function; e.g., secretaries may be chosen for the status they give their bosses in having educated, attractive secretaries, whether or not their skills are utilized, and acquisition of a secretary may be a status symbol in its own right in many organizations, signifying a manager's importance.[9]

Within the organizational structure secretarial positions are probably the most dramatic example of the much larger issue of the relationships between sex-typed roles. But the whole problem has, nevertheless, been largely neglected in organization research. Let us turn to a re-examination of historical models of organizations to see why.

EARLY MODELS OF ORGANIZATIONS: MANAGERIALISM AND A "MASCULINE ETHIC"

The period 1890-1910 brought what Daniel Bell (1957) has called "the breakup of family capitalism" — the beginnings of corporate mergers and finance capitalism (through bank intervention), which increasingly took (at least daily) control out of the hands of owners and put it in the domain of professional managers of large organizations. In 1941 James Burnham maintained that the character of twentieth-century economic organizational life was determined by this "managerial revolution" (Burnham, 1941). Whether or not capital owners actually did fade into the background, a point of some dispute (see Zeitlin, 1974), the rise of large organizations created a new and growing profession, with an internal decision-making monopoly and authority over those within the organization.

The advantages, authority, and control of the newly prominent managers required explanation and justification (Bendix, 1963). The new career managers lacked a class position buttressed by tradition that would provide grounds for legitimation, seeking it instead in the increasing professionalization of management, in the development of a "spirit of managerialism" that gave ideological coherence to the control of a relatively small and exclusive group of men over a large group of workers.[10] A social science both of management and of organizations grew with the growth of large organizations. This early organization theory aided legitimation of managerialism in several ways: first, by accepting, more or less uncritically, management's definition of itself, its tasks, and its importance; second, by providing both concepts (through research and writing) and an academic base (through schools of administration) that confirmed the power and perquisites of managers as well as educating them to managerial theory.[11]

The class origins of early-to-mid-twentieth-century top-business management — largely white, Protestant men from elite schools — and the connections of such a social base with managerial ideologies have been rather extensively documented (Burnham, 1941; Miller, 1950, 1952; Warner and Abegglen, 1955; Sutton et al., 1956). Given the virtually all-male occupancy of these positions, it is worth examining whether sexual status, in conjunction with class and ethnicity, was also reflected in managerial ideologies and models of organization, thus helping solidify the already apparent sex stratification of organizations.

A "masculine ethic" of rationality and reason can be identified in the early image of managers. This "masculine ethic" elevates the traits assumed to belong to men with educational advantages to necessities for effective organizations: a tough-minded approach to problems; analytic abilities to abstract and plan; a capacity to set aside personal, emotional considerations in the interests of task accomplishment; and a cognitive superiority in problem solving and decision making. These characteristics were assumed to belong to management in two early models of organizations. This view both supported managerial authority and served as intellectual blindfolds, limiting the utility of the models for social research.

RATIONAL MODELS

Social science first came to define modern organizations as rational instruments oriented to the attainment of specific goals, in which the unequal distribution of authority aided efficiency. (The classical "rational" models have already been criticized from a variety of perspectives, so that few social scientists today would actually agree to such limited definitions of organizations. See especially Argyris, 1957, 1972, 1973.)

During the same turn-of-the-century period that generated the growth of large organizations and professional management, Frederick I. Taylor introduced his theories of "scientific management" (the label was applied by Louis D. Brandeis in 1910) to American audiences, becoming a business consultant and prime creator of "classical" administrative theory. Taylor's premise was the application of the systematic analysis of science to management methods, emphasizing routines, order, logic, production planning, and cost analysis (Taylor, 1947; Tillett, Kempner, and Wills, 1970). His ideas influenced task specialization, time-and-motion studies, and assembly-line philosophies. Taylor's work also supported professional management at a time when unions were gaining in strength and employers were waging militant antiunion campaigns (Cochran, 1957). Taylor separated technical ability to perform a limited task from cognitive ability to abstract, plan, and logically understand the whole process; the latter was the special ability of management. Later Chester Barnard (1938) modified the idea of rationality; his conception of the rational organization was based on information and decisions rather than on routines and the orderly structuring of positions. He stressed communication (including informal channels) rather than hierarchy per se, but the need for a class of decision makers was clear. Goals were the special responsibility of the manager, whose functions included abstract generalizing and long-range planning. Authority was a necessary by-product of these decision-making functions (Tillett, Kempner, and Wills, 1970). (Herbert Simon has continued this tradition.)

Early organization theory thus developed rationality as the central ideal of formal organizations and hierarchy as the central structural principle. Organizations were considered tools for generating rational decisions and plans. Workers were motivated to participate on utilitarian grounds and could contribute specific skills, but the real effectiveness of the organization was seen to lie in the efforts of management to design the best way

for individuals to fit together in an overall scheme. The rationality of the formal organization was thought to arise not so much from the nature of its participants as from the superiority of its plan, but the plan depended on rational decision makers. The design could minimize the nonrational, efficiency-undermining features of human beings to the extent that the participants consented to authority up the line. The very design of organizations thus was oriented toward, and assumed to be capable of, suppressing irrationality, personality, and emotionality, and people who had these unfortunate characteristics were devalued and kept from influencing the otherwise flawless machine. For Weber this gave bureaucratic organizations their advantage of efficiency over other types of corporate groups; bureaucracy was the truly "passionless" organization (Gerth and Mills, 1958:215-16).[12]

The development of the classical rational model limited research and theory in several directions. The model assumed that it was possible to design or engineer efficient structures, given specific, measurable goals. In emphasizing the goal-directed features of modern organizations, a consideration that in itself posed analytic difficulties,[13] it in turn focused attention on the visible, public-role players, the officials with the power to "speak for" and decide for the organization. The focus on goals in part legitimized managerial authority on other than political grounds, for managers were conceptualized as the keepers of the "goals," while workers were seen as free to act in terms of their own self-interest alone. An extension of the concern with goals and measures of output and efficiency was that the relative importance of sectors of an organization was seen in terms of their connection with the specific goals and/or production plans, and that segments of the system contributing in other ways — e.g., internal service or maintenance — were generally ignored in analysis. Given the concentration of women in such maintenance-support functions as office work, it was likely that the position of women and other such workers, the demands of their roles, their particular structural situation, and their contribution to the system would be underexamined, as indeed these issues have been in the organizational literature. Much research in the rational-model tradition emphasizes either structural design features or systems analyses of such issues as communication channels and horizontal and vertical linkages. Wider issues of organizational stratification, as opposed to narrower issues of the number and types of positions and their direct linkages, were generally not considered. Finally, the classical model also supported managerial authority and a masculine ethic of rationality. While organizations were being defined as sex-neutral machines, masculine principles were dominating their authority structures.

HUMAN-RELATIONS MODELS

The 1930s and 1940s gave rise to another model of organizations. A group of researchers working with Elton Mayo at Harvard Business School, beginning in the mid-1920s, discovered the importance for productivity of primary, informal relations among workers in the Hawthorne experiments (discussed later in this article; see also Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939; Mayo, 1933).[14] This generated the concept of "informal organization" to include the emotional, nonrational, and sentimental aspects of human behavior in organizations, the ties and loyalties that affected workers. "Formal organization" came to refer to those features studied by the classical model, i.e., the organizational pattern designed by management: positions, functions, division of labor, relationships as defined by the organization chart, distribution of material rewards and privileges, and the official rules; "informal organization" to the social relations developed among workers beyond the formal ones given by the organization or to

61

the actual behavior resulting from working relations rather than rote obedience to official rules (see Etzioni, 1964:40). The human-relations model assumed that people were motivated by social as well as economic rewards and that their behavior and attitudes were a function of group memberships. The model emphasized the roles of participation, communication patterns, and leadership style in effecting organizational outcomes.

While introducing social considerations and focusing on the human side of organizations, the human-relations analysts supported the concept of managerial authority and managerial rationality. In Mayo's view, workers were controlled by sentiment, emotion, and social instincts, and this phenomenon needed to be understood and taken into account in organizational functioning. Managers, on the other hand, were rational, logical, and able to control their emotions in the interests of organizational design (Mayo, 1933:122). Though the emphasis on informal, social factors could not be further from the factors considered important by scientific management, the view of the role of management in an organization was strikingly similar (Bendix, 1963:312). If the human-relations school's metaphor was the "family" rather than the "machine" of classical models, the organization was still thought to require a rational controller at its head. A consequence of this perspective, Reinhard Bendix has indicated, was a simplified version, which viewed the successful manager as the man who could control his emotions, whereas workers could not. Bendix quotes a 1947 management manual: "He [the leader] knows that the master of men has physical energies and skills and intellectual abilities, vision and integrity, and he knows that, above all, the leader must have emotional balance and control. The great leader is even-tempered when others rage, brave when others fear, calm when others are excited, self-controlled when others indulge" (Bendix, 1963:312). He found a strikingly similar description of the superiority of the manager lying in the manager's ability to control his emotions, in a 1931 volume. One does not have to look too far beyond such statements for the basis of the viewpoint of some managers in a 1965 survey that women were "temperamentally unfit" for management because they are too emotional (Bowman, Worthy, and Greyser, 1965).

Further, the literature on informal organization derived from the human-relations model, though introducing "nonrational" elements into organizational behavior, in practice turned out largely to *support* the rational bias of the formal system. Roethlisberger and Dickson as well as Warner and Low distinguished in their writing between the managerial elite's logic of efficiency and the workers' logic of sentiment. Informal organization was studied more often among workers or between workers and supervisor, leaving the impression that only workers have informal ties — managers do not (see Gouldner, 1959:407). There seems to be some support in the human-relations model, too, then, for managerial authority and the association of characteristics of the "masculine ethic" with management.

Research and theory based on the human-relations model proved limited in other ways. They tended to focus on informal work-group relations in an abstract sense — independent of task, functional, or structural relationship to other organizational units, power and status outside of the group, or historical/cultural backdrop. Thus, many studies considered to be organizationally relevant were conducted in the laboratory in artificial situations rather than in the field. Findings about group cohesion, or leaders and subordinates, for example, were assumed to be generalizable over large numbers of kinds of groups, regardless of the complexities of the structural situations in which relationships in real organizations might be embedded.

Such, then, was the historical legacy of American organization theory. The early rational and human-relations models tended to support a managerial viewpoint that, in turn, can be seen to have latent functions as a "masculine ethic," congruent with the nearly exclusively male occupancy of the newly prominent careers in management and administration. The focus on managerial rationality could also justify the absence of women — the bearers of emotion — from power. At the same time, these leanings of traditional organization theory also had intellectual consequences, limiting its analytic perspective. Larger issues of organizational structure and stratification and their relation to social placement in the larger society, the differential distributions of men and women, and the consequences of these for organizational behavior — these questions were largely unnoticed. If the status quo of power in organizations and women's disadvantaged position was supported, it was as much because of intellectual blinders as because of deliberate intent. Theorists did not necessarily *want* to neglect women or keep them in their place, but the theorists tended not to see them because of the limits of the early models, and the theorists tended to assume that women were doing just what they ought to be doing: the office housework.

A STRUCTURALIST PERSPECTIVE ON WOMEN AND ORGANIZATIONS

It is now time for use of a newer, more eclectic and integrated model, one that *can* examine structural issues in organizations and their consequences for behavior. This more recent model, which Amatai Etzioni has termed "structuralist" (1964:41) (though it also encompasses the work of Argyris, Katz and Kahn, neo-Marxists, and others), addresses itself to the weaknesses of the earlier theories and is capable of offering enlarged understanding of women's position and behavior in organizations. A structuralist perspective views the organization as a large, complex social unit in which many groups interact. These groups are defined both by their formal (task-related, functional) and informal connections and differentiations. The relative number and power of such organizational groupings, their tasks, and the ways in which they come into contact shape the nature of the organization. Groups may comprise different strata, like different social classes, with interests and values potentially in conflict, and integration between them limited by the potential for conflicts of interest. Those with power wield it in the interests of their own group as well as perhaps in the interests of the system as a whole (though in this model it is often difficult to define such collective interests). Self-interest, including material self-interest, is considered as potentially important as social needs, so that the formation of relationships should be seen in the more political sense of advantage to the person as well as in the human-relations sense of social satisfaction. Further, people are viewed as members of groups outside as well as inside of the organization, which both help to place them within the organization, give them status, define their involvement with it, and may or may not articulate with the organization's interests. Finally, the tasks of the organization and the tasks of those within it (the division of labor) are important because they define the number, interests, and relative arrangements of organizational classes as well as how informal relations may articulate with formal ones.

The "sex-typing" of occupations and professions is relatively well known — the fact that many occupations are nearly exclusively filled by members of one sex and come to have a "gender," to be described in sex-role-appropriate terms. But to fully describe the position and behavior of women (and men) in organizations, we must understand not only their typical occupations (e.g., manager and secretary) but how

these are *related* to one another and to the larger context of the organization as a social structure. Occupations carry with them membership in particular organizational classes. Each class may have its own internal hierarchy, political groupings and allegiances, interactional rules, ways of coming into contact with other classes, promotion rules, culture, and style, including demeanor and dress.[15] In many organizations, managers and clerical workers, for example, constitute two separate organizational classes, with separate hierarchies, rules, and reward structures, and practically no mobility between them. The managerial elite has the power and a group interest in retaining it. The position of clerical workers, on the other hand, is often anomalous: in contact with the organizational elite, dependent on, and in service to it, thus facilitating identification with it, but similar to other workers in subordination, lack of autonomy, and subjugation to routine (Crozier, 1965).

The economic concept of an "internal labor market" (Doeringer and Piore, 1971) is applicable here. When women enter an organization, they are placed not only in jobs but in an opportunity structure. Internal allocation of personnel is governed by hiring, promotion, and layoff rules within each structure, as well as by "suitability," as defined by the customs of each separate workplace. And ability in one workplace is not always transferable to others; what leads to success in one may even be dysfunctional for mobility into another. The rules of the internal labor market, Doeringer and Piore theorize, may vary from rigid and internally focused to highly responsive to external economic forces; rules also vary among organizational strata. They argue, for example, that there is a tendency for managerial markets, in contrast with other internal labor markets, to span more than one part of a company, to carry an implicit employment guarantee, and to reward ability rather than seniority (1971:3). But women participate in a different labor market than men, even within the same organization. Their "typical jobs" in the office carry with them not only sex-role demands but also placement in a class and hierarchy that itself limits mobility into positions of power.

The issue, thus, is not a mere division of labor between women and men but a difference of organizational class, at least on the administrative levels of modern organizations. Simplistically, women are part of a class rewarded for routine service, while men compose a class rewarded for decision-making rationality and visible leadership, and this potential membership affects even those found outside their own sexual class. This phenomenon constitutes the structural backdrop for an understanding of the organizational behavior of women and men.

Even though it is largely ignored in the organizational behavior literature, sex can be seen to be an important variable affecting the lives of groups, given the significant differences in the positions and power of women and men in society and in organizations. The sexual composition of a group appears to have impact on behavior around issues of power and leadership, aspirations, peer relations, and the relative involvement/visibility or isolation/invisibility of members.

SEX AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: FEMALE AND MALE SINGLE-SEX GROUPS

Does a group of women behave differently from a group of men? The situations in which women and men find themselves are often so different that common-sense observation indicates a difference in both themes and process. Organizational research, on the other hand, has generally treated all groups of participants or workers alike, for the most part not distinguishing sex as a variable, and therefore implicitly assuming that gender does not make a difference in organizational behavior — reinforcing the

mistaken idea that modern organizational life is universalistic and sex-neutral. Yet, even in the classic study that first discovered the importance of small, primary groups in worker behavior and opened the study of human relations in organizations, the sex of the groups studied varied and may have contributed to the different sets of specific findings. The experiments at the Hawthorne plant of Western Electric in the late 1920s and early 1930s developed the concept of informal organization by indicating how important a role the small group might play in worker productivity (cf. Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939). These researchers have been examined and re-examined for all possible explanations of the findings, including, recently, operant conditioning (Parsons, 1974); sex composition is, to my knowledge, not mentioned among them. Three small groups were studied. In two sets of conditions, the Relay Assembly Test Room and the Mica Splitting Test Room, workers encouraged each other in raising productivity and believed that their efforts would be rewarded. In the third, the Bank Wiring Observation Room, workers developed an informal system that discouraged "rate busting" and kept productivity at an even keel, partly out of a mistrust in management — the belief that increased productivity would result in higher expectations, not higher rewards. There were differences among the three sets of conditions in size of group (fourteen in the third, vs. five or six in the first and second, depending on how the team is counted), nature of the task (a large number of units processed by individuals in the first two conditions, a small number of units in the third), experimental manipulations (like rest pauses), and "laboratory" vs. "natural" working conditions. But another striking difference is sex. The first two sets of groups, co-operative and trusting of management, were all female. The third, counterdependent, aggressively controlling, and suspicious, was all male.

There is also evidence, if we reinterpret other studies not explicitly focused on sex, that women in female groups may be more oriented toward immediate relationships than men in male groups. Several studies of male professionals in organizations found a correlation between professionalism and a "cosmopolitan" rather than a local orientation. The exception was a study of nurses by Warren Bennis and colleagues. In this *female* group, the more professionally oriented nurses "did not differ from others in their loyalty to the hospital, and they were *more* apt than others, not less, to express loyalty to the local work group" (Blau and Scott, 1962:69). While Blau and Scott conclude that this is due to the limited visibility of the nurses' professional competence, other evidence indicates that this finding is consistent with a sex-linked interpretation. Constantini and Craik (1972) found, for example, that women politicians in California were oriented intraparty and locally rather than toward higher office, as men were.

Other evidence confirms that women in organizations, especially in the clerical class, limit their ambitions, prefer local and immediate relationships, and orient themselves to satisfying peer relationships. In a study of values of 120 occupational groups, secretaries, the only female group studied, were unique in placing their highest priorities on such values as security, love, happiness, and responsibility (Sikula, 1973). Female game-playing strategy in several laboratory studies was accommodative, including rather than excluding, and oriented toward others rather than toward winning, whereas the male strategy was exploitative and success-oriented (Vinacke, 1959; Uesugi and Vinacke, 1963). All-female group themes in a comparison of single-sex and mixed laboratory groups included affiliation, family, and conflicts about competition and leadership, self, and relationships, in contrast to the male themes: competition, aggression, violence,

victimization, practical joking, questions of identity, and fear of self-disclosure (Aries, 1973). An earlier study compared all-male with all-female groups and found *no* significant differences in nine different conditions *except* persuasibility (higher in female groups) and level of aspiration (higher in male groups) (Cattell and Lawson, 1962).

In attitudinal studies distinguishing factors motivating increased performance as opposed to those merely preventing dissatisfaction ("hygiene" factors), attitudes toward interpersonal relations with peers constituted the only variable differentiating men and women. (The women in two studies included those in both high-level and low-level jobs.) For women, peer relationships were a motivational factor, whereas for men they were merely a hygiene factor (Davis, 1967:35-36). Structural factors can explain this. My field research in progress on a large New York-based corporation indicates that peer relations affect a woman's decision not to seek promotion into managerial ranks, where she will no longer be part of a group of women; for men, of course, peer relations are a given throughout managerial ranks, and therefore, perhaps, more easily "taken for granted."

Other differences in male and female behavior in single-sex settings fail to be consistently demonstrated, as the Cattell and Lawson (1962) research, above, indicates. (See also Mann, 1959.) In studies of sex differences in the "risky shift," for example (the tendency for groups to make riskier decisions than individuals), there were *no* significant differences between male and female college students in initial conservatism or in the shift to risky decisions in the single-sex groups (Wallach, Kogan, and Bem, 1968). Organizational comparisons are rare, but Crozier's data on forty groups of French office workers revealed no difference in an atmosphere between male and female work groups; both kinds of groups showed the same wide range (1965:111).

Thus it is reasonable to hypothesize that groups of women differ from groups of men primarily in orientations toward interpersonal relationships and level of aspiration. One might interpret this as consistent with the training of women for family roles and thus label it a sex-linked attribute. But such orientations could also be seen as *realistic responses* to women's structural situation in organizations, of the kinds of opportunities and their limits, of the role demands in the organizational strata occupied by women, and of the dependence of women on relationships for mobility.

MIXED-SEX GROUPS

When men and women are together, in roughly equal numbers, as peers, tensions may emerge, and the behavior of each sex may be influenced. In Aries' laboratory study, people in two cross-sex groups were more tense, serious, self-conscious, and concerned with heterosexual attractiveness than those in the same-sex groups. Women generally spoke less than men (Aries, 1973). The sexual questions and "cross-cultural" issues that can arise in mixed-sex groups are useful explanations for their tensions; William Foote Whyte has hypothesized, extrapolating from studies of the ethnic composition of groups, that "other things being equal, a one-sex work group is likely to be more cohesive" than a mixed-sex group (1961: 511). Crozier's Parisian study found male-female conflicts when men and women worked in the same office (1965:110).

In addition to sexual and cultural issues, there are also status and power issues when men and women interact, a function of the structural positions and organizational class memberships of the sexes. Much social psychological research has indicated the importance of power and status in determining behavior in groups: e.g., those low in power tend to engage in more approval seeking, while those high in power engage in more

influence attempts; those in low-status positions tend to communicate upward in a hierarchy, a form of "substitute locomotion" or "vicarious mobility." The differential behavior of the more and less powerful coincides with the observed group behavior of men and women. A field experiment tested more specifically the effects of high and low power on group relations, using thirty-two six-person groups at a one-day professional conference. Participants were labeled high-power or low-power on the basis of the prestige of their occupations, assumed to correlate with ability to influence. While the authors do not report the sex distribution of participants, it is likely from occupational sex-typing that men were found more often in the high-power category (psychiatrists, psychologists) and women in the low-power category (nurses, social workers, teachers). The researchers found that "highs" were liked more than "lows"; "highs" liked "lows" less than they liked other "highs"; "highs" talked more often than "lows"; "lows" communicated more frequently to "highs" than to other "lows"; and the amount of participation by "lows" was consistently overrated, as though people felt the "lows" talked too much (Hurwitz, Zander, and Hymovitch, 1968).

The interpretation is straightforward. In mixed groups of "peers," men and women may not, in fact, be equal, especially if their external statuses and organizational class memberships are discrepant. The resulting behavior, including frequency of participation, leadership, and conformity, may reflect status and power differences more than sex-linked personality traits.

THE EFFECTS OF SKEWED SEX RATIOS: THE LONE WOMAN IN THE MALE GROUP

The dynamic of interaction in settings with highly skewed sex ratios — numerical dominance by members of one sex and a "lone" or nearly alone member of the other sex — also deserves attention; in management and some professions, women are often one of very few women in a group of men. This makes "sex status" as important for interaction as occupational status (Epstein, 1970:152).

Skewed sex ratios lend themselves, first, to cases of "mistaken identity" — to incorrect attributions. Lone women in male settings are sometimes initially misperceived as a result of their statistical rarity. The men with whom they come into contact may make a judgment about what a woman is doing in that particular situation, based on reasoning about the probabilities of various explanations, and may act toward her accordingly. This can be called "statistical discrimination" (Council of Economic Advisers, 1973:106), to distinguish it from prejudice; that is, an unusual woman may be treated as though she resembles women on the average. This may be the case every time someone assumes a female manager answering the telephone or sitting in an office is a secretary (cf. examples in Lynch, 1973; Epstein, 1970:191). Given the current occupational distribution, that person is likely to be correct a high proportion of the time. But the woman in question may still feel unfairly treated, as indeed she is, and there may be awkward exchanges while the woman's true identity is established.[16]

Attributions may also be made about the lone woman's expected informal role. These attributions put the woman in her place without challenging the male culture of the group. Field observations of lone women in male-dominated groups (including business meetings, academic conferences, sales training programs, and postprofessional training groups) have distinguished four kinds of roles attributed to lone women in male groups: "mother"; "sex object" or "seductress"; "pet" (group mascot); and "iron maiden" (militant and unapproachable) (Kanter, 1975). Such attributed

roles affect both what the men in the group expect of the woman and how they interpret what she does. For her, the pressure is to confine her behavior to the limits of the role, whether or not it expresses her competence. Indeed, the roles provide a measure of security and uncertainty-reduction for some women, while others may devote time to struggling against the implications of the attributions. In either case, a woman's behavior in a situation like this is less likely to reflect her competencies, and it may take her longer to establish them, than at other times, when she is not a statistical rarity.

Several hypotheses are suggested. When a person is a statistical rarity, it may take her/him *more time* to untangle mistaken identities and establish a competence-based working relationship, particularly with members of the numerically dominant category. This may, in turn, generate a preference for minimizing change in work relations with peers, superiors/subordinates, or clients. As Epstein argues, "status discrepancies make continuous role definition necessary during interactions that should be routine" (1970:194). Margaret Cussler's (1958) sample of female executives in the 1950s suggests that this hypothesis may have some validity, for the women apparently changed work situations much less often than would be expected of male counterparts. Thus there may be a longer timespan for the establishment of competence-based relationships and a conservatism about changing relationships among "lone" women in male-dominated organizations.

Isolation and invisibility, self- as well as group-imposed, are often consequences of status as a lone woman in an otherwise all-male collectivity. In one study, six small training groups with only one woman each in a group of eight to twelve men were observed: three sensitivity training groups for business school students, and three work groups of psychiatric residents. In each case, the woman was eventually isolated, failed to become a leader or ally herself with the emergent leaders, and was defined by the researchers as a "casualty" of the groups. The researchers felt that the six groups' productivity tended to be low, in part because of the problematic interactions around the solo woman (Wolman and Frank, 1975). While the results of this study should not be taken as definitive,[17] they do suggest directions for further inquiry.

The female executives studied by Margaret Hennig (1970) support the isolation hypothesis. They reported that their most difficult relationships were with male peers when they (the women) were in the early to middle career. The women had little contact or relationship with the men, tried to be unobstrusive or invisible, and practiced strategies of conflict avoidance, as did lone professional women in Cynthia Epstein's research (1970: 176). Epstein also suggests that team membership may be harder for the lone woman among male professional peers than for a man, pointing to institutionalized isolation (such as barriers to membership in male clubs or associations) as well as interactional isolation. As a consequence, she proposes that women have been less likely to be successful in fields that require participation on a team of peers as opposed to individual activity (1970:175).

Lone women may reinforce their own isolation by a series of accommodative strategies. The limiting of visibility ("taking a low profile") is one such accommodation to and reinforcement of isolation. Hennig's respondents reported early career strategies of trying to minimize their sexual attributes so as to blend unnoticeably into the predominant male culture:

> You dressed carefully and quietly to avoid attracting attention; you had to remember to swear once in a while, to know a few dirty jokes, and never to cry if

you got attacked. You fended off all attempts of men to treat you like a woman; you opened doors before they could hold them, sat down before a chair could be held, and threw on a coat before it could be held for you [Hennig, 1970:vi-21].

In other reports, lone women managers have also participated in the limiting of the visibility of their competence by not taking credit for accomplishments or letting someone else take the credit (Lynch, 1973; Cussler, 1958). Some women, in interviews, even expressed pride that they could influence a group of men without the men recognizing the origin of the idea, or they rejoiced in the secret knowledge that they were responsible for their boss's success. (These reports match the Megaree finding reported below that high-dominance women may let a man assume official leadership while strongly influencing the decision.) Epstein (1970) points out that, in general, on elite levels women have less-visible jobs than men, promote themselves less often, feel the need to make fewer mistakes, and try to be unobtrusive.

With another context in mind, Seymour Sarason (1973) has argued that members of minority groups who have succeeded may try to limit the visibility of that success in fear of reprisals from the majority-dominant group, which might not be aware of the minority's success and might take action against it if known. He has reported a prevalent feeling among Jews that statistics about the high percentage of Jews in elite colleges such as Yale, for example, should not be broadcast. A concern like this, rather than a female sex-linked characteristic, could account for the woman manager's acceptance of the invisibility of her achievements. In the case of lone women, the pressure to adopt this stance must be even greater because of attributes like modesty assigned to the female stereotype.

This analysis suggests a re-examination of the "fear of success" in women hypothesis. Perhaps what has been called fear of success is really fear of visibility. In the original research by Matina Horner (1968) that identified this concept, women responded to a hypothetical situation in which a woman was at the top of her class in medical school — presumably a lone woman in a male peer group. Such a situation is the kind that creates pressure for a woman to make herself and her achievements invisible. When similar research was conducted using settings in which a woman is not a statistical rarity, "fear of success" imagery was greatly reduced (Tresemer, 1973).

WOMEN AND LEADERSHIP

If it's hard to demonstrate competence as a woman among men, it may be even harder to exercise leadership, given the current sex-stratification patterns in organizations. It is still an open question whether there are major sex differences in leadership *style* (Crozier, 1965:126, finds none); but the structural and interactional context is certainly different for women. Taking directives from a woman has been anathema to most men and some women. In a 1965 *Harvard Business Review* survey of 1,000 male and 900 female executives, over two-thirds of the men and nearly one-fifth of the women reported that they themselves would not feel comfortable working for a woman. Very few of either sex (9 per cent of the men and 15 per cent of the women) felt that *men* feel comfortable working for a women; and a proportion of the male respondents said that women did not belong in executive positions. A total of 51 per cent of the men responded that women were "temperamentally unfit" for management, writing comments such as, "They scare male executives half to death....As for an efficient woman manager, this is cultural blasphemy...." (Bowman, Worthy, and Greyser, 1965.)

Male resentment of taking orders from a woman influenced the work flow and the interaction between waitresses and countermen in the restaurants

studied by William Foote Whyte during World War II, a classic of organizational analysis. There were several devices in one restaurant by which countermen could avoid direct contact with waitresses (and hence direct orders) or could make their own decisions about the order in which to prepare food and drinks, thus taking initiative and forcing the waitresses to wait. Orders were written on slips and placed on a spindle, and a warming compartment imposed a high barrier between the waitresses and the countermen, thus eliminating face-to-face interaction. In a restaurant without these equalizing devices, satisfaction was low, and there was constant wrangling. Whyte's explanation is simple: People of higher status (men) like to do the directing for people of lower status (women) and resent reversals (1961:128).

Even if women have formal authority, then, they may not necessarily be able to exercise it over reluctant subordinates. Margaret Cussler's (1958) study of female executives provides several examples of this. In one case a woman had formal leadership of a group of men, but the men did not accept this, reporting informally to her male superior. The subordinates further met together at lunch to share information, excluding her. More formal meetings then developed, "conceived of by the woman as meetings of her staff, by the men as a mutual protection society for the interchange of ideas" (1958:76-77).

At the same time, women tend to assume visible leadership reluctantly, in keeping with the invisibility of the lone woman mentioned earlier. A creative laboratory study discovered that for women the situational context rather than a dominant personality tended to predict a woman's exercise of visible leadership. Same-sex and cross-sex dyads were paired by scores on a "dominance" measure and given a task in which one member had to lead and one to follow. Assumption of leadership by high-dominance women paired with a low-dominance man was significantly lower than in any other pairing. The greatest assumption of leadership by high-dominance subjects occurred when a high-dominance man was paired with a low-dominance woman; the high- and low-dominance single-sex pairings showed about the same intermediate distribution of leadership. However, in the situation in which a high-dominance woman was paired with a low-dominance man, the *woman* made the final decision of who was to be the leader more often than in any other group, 91 per cent of the time *appointing the man*. The study suggests that men are not necessarily more "dominant" in character than women, but women are more reluctant to assume leadership, particularly when the subordinate is male (Megaree, 1969). The leadership strategies chosen by successful women executives in Hennig's research (1970) tend to confirm this kind of laboratory finding. The women tended to minimize the authoritative exercise of power and maximize subordinate autonomy and learning through delegation.

But a leader's style may be ultimately less important for the impact on his or her subordinates than another resource unequally distributed between the sexes: power outside of the immediate work group. Early theory in organizational behavior assumed a direct relation between leader behavior and group satisfaction and morale. However, Donald Pelz discovered in the early 1950s that perceived external power was an intervening variable. He compared high- and low-morale work groups to test the hypothesis that the supervisor in high-morale groups would be better at communicating, more supportive, and more likely to recommend promotion. Yet, when he analyzed the data, the association seemed to be nonexistent or even reversed. In some cases supervisors who frequently recommended people for promotion and offered sincere praise for a job well done had *lower* morale scores. The differentiating variable was whether or not the

leader had power outside and upward: influence on his or her own superiors and how decisions were made in the department. The combination of good human relations *and* power was associated with high morale. Human-relations skills and low power (a likely combination for women leaders) sometimes had negative consequences (Pelz, 1952).

The implications for female leadership in organizations are significant. A woman's generally more limited power (partly a function of her rarity and isolation in management), as well as her similarity to a subordinate clerical class rather than the elite, may interfere with her effective exercise of leadership *regardless* of her own style and competence. This hypothesis also helps explain the greater resistance to working for a woman. It also may account for the evidence of the importance of a male sponsor in the success of women executives (Cussler, 1958; Hennig, 1970). A high-status man bringing the woman up behind him may provide the visible sign that the woman does have influence upward. While sponsors serve multiple functions (e.g., coaching and socialization in the informal routines) and are found in the careers of men, the "reflected power" they provide may be even more pivotal for women.

CONCLUSION: WOMEN AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF ORGANIZATIONS

Women's places in organizations have largely had limited visibility and low status; they have been part of the unexamined infrastructure. When men and women interact in organizations, they often do it across barriers like that of social class; women's mobility has largely been restricted to the infrastructure. In this the women within organizations have a kinship with the "women's auxiliary" outside of it — the network of wives of managers and leaders that perform unpaid tasks, play unofficial but normatively expected roles for the organization, and whose behavior can potentially affect relations in the official organization (Kanter, 1974). Just as managers have a group of women behind them in the office, they do at home, for male managers are largely married to women not employed in the paid labor force.[18]

I have suggested a few of the issues surrounding the sexual structure of organizations and groups that deserve further attention — from the problems of token women to the nature of internal labor markets for managers or secretaries. The sexual division of broad administrative classes was solidified very early in the history of large corporations. But the nature of organizational life for these broad groupings and other occupational subgroups, and how their opportunities and interactions vary in different kinds of organizations (e.g., those with fewer barriers to leadership for women), still require investigation. The ideological underpinnings of modern organizations, such as the connection between a "masculine ethic" and a "spirit of managerialism," need further examination. To understand the structural conditions for men and women in organizations and the organizational behavior of men and women is critical for both social inquiry and social change.

NOTES

I wish to thank the following people for their critical comments and support: Nancy Chodorow, Susan Eckstein, Joan Huber, Barry Stein, Chris Argyris, Zick Rubin, William Form, William Torbert, Caroline Butterfield, and Joanna Hiss.

[1]Data are from HEW, via a University of Minnesota publication, reprinted by the Women's Equity Action League, Washington, D.C., in 1974. M.D.'s and other professional doctorates are not included. Women earned 11.63 per cent of the total doctorates reported, but only 2.82 per cent of the doctorates in business and commerce (a total of 86 women in 10 years), 5 per cent of those in hospital administration (1 woman out of 20 doctorates), and none of those in trade or industrial training. Women earned 11.10 per cent of all the social science doctorates but only 4.17 per cent of those in industrial relations and 8.13 per cent of those in public administration.

[3]Of the managers and administrators earning over $15,000 per year, 26.1 per cent of the women vs. 17.2 per cent of the men are in retail trade, 25.8 per cent of the women vs. 8.5 per cent of the men are in "professional and related services," and 12.2 per cent of the women vs. 26.7 per cent of the men are in manufacturing. Women represent 9.3 per cent of the total managers in services but only 1.52 per cent of the total in manufacturing. Calculations from Census Bureau (1973b).

[4]Several popularized accounts treat management as an expression of the instincts of male hunting bands and make management, indeed, seem charged with masculine culture and traditions. See Tiger (1969) and Jay (1967, 1971).

[5]Margery Davies (1974) discovered that a 1916 *Ladies' Home Journal* article was already glorifying the feminine traits of stenographers: radiating sympathetic interest, agreeableness, courtesy. In 1900, however, the same magazine was urging women to stay out of offices.

[6]See also recent journalistic accounts by Garson (1973) and Langer (1970); on secretaries see Benet (1973) and Halter et al. (1973).

[7]A New York corporation informant, a former executive secretary promoted into management, told me that leaving her boss was like getting a divorce. For the first four months of her new job, she stopped in to see him every morning and hung her coat in her old office.

[8]A manager of clerical employees told me that sometimes promotions mean that secretaries have *less* work to do and have trouble justifying their larger salaries to their peers. As with marriage, if a woman has the good fortune to be connected with a high-status male, she gets more money and does less work.

[9]The large corporation in my research, beginning to design "upward mobility" programs for women, has discovered secretarial work to be arbitrary and particularistic. The change effort includes generating job descriptions and decoupling a secretary's status from her boss's so that she will no longer derive rank from him or necessarily move with him when he moves.

[10]A chatty advice-to-managers book (Burger, 1964) devotes a chapter to "living with your secretary," with whom, the book declares, a man spends more of his waking hours than with his wife. She is a status symbol: "In many companies, a secretary outside your door is the most visible sign that you have become an executive; a secretary is automatically assigned to each executive, whether or not his work load requires one....When you reach vice-presidential level, your secretary may have an office of her own, with her name on the door. At the top, the president may have two secretaries....'Miss Amy, please take a letter,' are words which have inwardly thrilled every young executive with a sense of his own importance...they symbolize power and status" (Burger, 1964:219, 220).

[11]Even today management has legitimacy issues. The tasks of management are largely intangible, and the results of managerial efforts depend largely on products of the work of other people. Technical expertise, according to analysts from Chester Barnard on, plays only a small role; indeed, many sociologists assume an organizational conflict between expertise and authority — i.e., between professionals and managers. The necessity (in economic and social terms) for large cadres of managers has yet to be demonstrated definitively (cf. the conflicting results of the several studies in Heydebrand, 1974). Barry Stein (1974) has marshaled evidence to indicate that the presumed efficiencies of scale in large organizations are often instead inefficiencies, and administrative costs are one important cause. A recent study of 167 large corporations over a 20-year period concludes that much of the variance in sales, earnings, and profit margins can be explained by factors other than the impact of management (Lieberson and O'Connor, 1972). To some extent, then, management may still have the tasks of justifying its necessity, importance, numbers, and privileges, though of course management in the 1970s is already very different in character from management of earlier years.

A provocative analogy could be made between management and fatherhood: necessary for conception but not visibly connected to or necessary for production thereafter. The uncertainty of management's actual connection to the results is like the uncertainty of paternity — the biological father can never be definitively identified. Yet in both cases control and the product's legitimacy are vested in the paternal figure. (I am indebted to Nancy Jay for the insight about fatherhood.)

[12]The first school of business at an American university was the Wharton School, founded in 1884 at the University of Pennsylvania. Management as a separate field was not introduced until decades later, at the Harvard Business School. The connection between theory and practice is especially great in this field. Many social scientists consult to industry and teach at schools of administration. A great deal of the early research on organizations was done at the invitation of management. Both Frederick Taylor and Chester Barnard, influential early- and middle-organization theorists, had backgrounds in industry, Barnard as president of New Jersey Bell. In Reinhard Bendix's

(1963) analysis of the development of American managerial ideology, social science was seen as playing a role in feeding concepts to management justifying authority and defining distance from workers. Alvin Gouldner goes even farther in connecting social science with legitimation of managerial authority (1959:414-15).

[12]Weber's notion of the virtues of bureaucracy's exclusion of passion converges interestingly with Freud's argument that women — the bearers of passion and sexuality — must be excluded from the workaday world of men. Women, Freud wrote in *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930), are driven by emotion and incapable of suppressing or sublimating their passions and sexual instincts as men could. Further, since the work of men in civilized societies removed them from their homes and families, women become hostile to the male world of organizations, constantly trying to lure men away from their higher, reasoned pursuits. Resisting female enticements, men carry on the burdens of government and rational thought; rationality is the male principle, in opposition to the female principle of emotionality. Men master their sexuality, in the Freudian view, while women cannot. It would be interesting to study the convergences of Weber and Freud, not only on male and female principles in organizational life but also on the origin and nature of authority.

[13]The literature abounds with examples of the difficulties one encounters in the concept of organizational goals. According to familiar analyses, goals may be: unclear, undefined, utopian, or nonoperational; precarious; changeable, in a process of goal succession or changing external conditions; ignored and/or deflected. There may be multiple goals, unstated goals, professed vs. operating goals, "task" vs. "maintenance" goals, and subgroup goals. There may be conflicts about which goals are thought appropriate by various segments of the organization, depending on their organizational position, internal or external constituency, and primary reference group. And there may be a wide gap between the stated goals of an organization and its functions for members or for society. See also Etzioni (1964).

[14]Mary Parker Follett was among the influential figures in generating this more human approach to management and one of the only important female organization theorists. Her interest in management grew out of her experience with the administration of social-welfare organizations.

[15]In a discussion of labor women, Patricia Cayo Sexton defines dress and hair style as well as personal appearance as a barrier to upward mobility, since the styles of labor women are very different from those of more elite women (1974:392-93). Informants in a corporation told me that there was a "caste" barrier between secretaries and professional women visible in style differences: e.g., secretaries wore platform shoes while professional women wore pumps.

[16]Sometimes the categorical attributions have extreme and negative implications: e.g., a female manager having a drink with her boss and assumed by a neighbor to be his mistress (Lynch, 1973:136). In another example, a woman executive was the only female present at an executive cocktail party at a New York hotel, when a drunk male guest entered, accosted her, and tried to tear her clothes off, assuming she was a call girl (Lynch, 1973:137).

[17]Aside from *post hoc* reasoning, one of the researchers, a woman, was also a group leader in some of the groups and does not discuss the impact of her own presence as another woman in a *powerful* position.

[18]A total of 93.19 per cent of the male managers earning $15,000 or more in 1969 were married; 72.25 per cent of their wives were not in the paid labor force (Bureau of Census, 1973b).

REFERENCES

Argyris, Chris. *Personality and Organization*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

_____. *The Applicability of Organizational Sociology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

_____. "Some Limits of Rational Man Organization Theory," *Public Administration Review* May-June, 1973, pp. 253-67.

Barnard, Chester I. *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bell, Daniel. "Work and Its Discontents: The Cult of Efficiency in America," *The End of Ideology*, 1956, rev. ed. New York: Collier Books, 1961, pp. 227-72.

_____. "The Breakup of Family Capitalism," *The End of Ideology*, 1957, rev. ed. New York: Collier Books, 1961.

Bendix, Reinhard. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait*. 1960. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books. 1962.

_____. *Work and Authority in Industry; Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialization*. New York: Harper & Row. 1963.

Benet, Mary Kathleen. *The Secretarial Ghetto*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1973.

Blau, Peter M., and Scott, W. Richard. *Formal Organizations*. San Francisco: Chandler. 1962.

Bowman, G. W.; Worthy, N.B.; and Greyser, S.A. "Are Women Executives People?," *Harvard Business Review* 43 July-August, 1965, pp. 14-30.

Bureau of the Census, U.S. *Occupational Characteristics*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1973a.

_____. *Occupations of Persons with Higher Earnings*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1973b.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. *Handbook of Labor Statistics*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Labor. 1971.

Burger, Chester. *Survival in the Executive Jungle*. New York: Macmillan. 1964.

Burnham, James. *The Managerial Revolution*. New York: John Day. 1941.

Cattell, Raymond B., and Lawson, Edwin D. "Sex Differences in Small Group Performance," *The Journal of Social Psychology* 58:141-45. 1962.

Cochran, Thomas C. *The American Business System: A Historical Perspective, 1900-1955*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1957.

Constantini, Edmond, and Craik, Kenneth H. "Women as Politicians: The Social Background, Personality, and Political Careers of Female Party Leaders," *Journal of Social Issues* 28:217-36. 1972.

Council of Economic Advisers. *Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1973.

Crozier, Michel. *The World of the Office Worker*, trans. David Landau. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1971.

Cussler, Margaret. *The Woman Executive*. New York: Harcourt, Brace. 1958.

Davies, Margery. "Woman's Place Is at the Typewriter: The Feminization of the Clerical Labor Force." Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Department of Sociology. 1974.

Davis, Keith. *Human Relations at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1967.

Doeringer, Peter B., and Piore, Michael J. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath. 1971.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. *Woman's Place: Options and Limits on Professional Careers*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1970.

Etzioni, Amatai. *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 1964.

Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*, 1930, trans. James Strachey. New York: Norton, 1962.

Garson, Barbara. "Women's Work," *Working Papers for a New Society* 1 Fall, 1973, pp. 5-14.

Gerth, Hans, and Mills, C. Wright (eds.). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1958.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Organizational Analysis," *Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects*, ed. R. K. Merton, L. Broon, and L. S. Cottrell, Jr. New York: Basic Books, 1959, pp. 400-28.

Halter, Marilyn; Schneider, Eric; and Weiner, Lynn. "Report from the 'Enormous File': A Case Study of Office Work." Boston: Boston University Department of History. 1973.

Hennig, Margaret. "Career Development for Women Executives," unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration. 1970.

Heydebrand, Wolf (ed.). *Comparative Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 1974.

Hill, Joseph A. *Women in Gainful Occupations, 1870-1920*. Census Monographs IX. 1929. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1972.

Horner, Matina. "Sex Differences in Achievement Motivation and Performance in Competitive and Non-Competitive Situations," unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan. 1968.

Hurwitz, Jacob I.; Zander, Alvin F.; and Hymovich, Bernard. "Some Effects of Power on the Relations Among Group Members," *Group Dynamics*, ed. D. Cartwright and A. Zander. New York: Harper & Row, 1968, pp. 291-97.

Jay, Anthony. *Management and Machiavelli: An Inquiry into the Politics of Corporate Life*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 1967.

_____. *Corporation Man*. New York: Random House. 1971.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "The Auxiliary Organization." Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Department of Sociology. 1974.

_____. "Women in Organizations: Sex Roles, Group Dynamics, and Change Strategies," *Beyond Sex Roles*, ed. A. Sargent. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing. 1975.

Langer, Elinor. "Inside the New York Telephone Company," *Women at Work*, ed. W. L. O'Neill. 1970. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1972, pp. 305-60.

Lieberson, Stanley, and O'Connor, John F. "Leadership and Organizational Performance: A Study of Large Corporations," *American Sociological Review* 37 April, 1972, pp. 117-30.

Lynch, Edith M. *The Executive Suite: Feminine Style*. New York: AMACOM. 1973.

Mayo, Elton. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. New York: Macmillan. 1933.

Megaree, Edwin I. "Influence of Sex Roles on the Manifestation of Leadership," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 53:377-82. 1969.

Miller, William. "The Recruitment of the American Business Elite," *Men in Business*, ed. W. Miller. 1950. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

_____. "The Business Elite in Business Bureaucracies: Careers of Top Executives in the Early Twentieth Century," *Men in Business*, ed. W. Miller. 1952. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, pp. 286-305; New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Mills, C. Wright. *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1951.

Morse, Nancy C. *Satisfaction in the White-Collar Job*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan. 1953.

Parsons, H. M. "What Happened at Hawthorne?," *Science* 183 March, 1974, pp. 922-32.

Pelz, Donald C. "Influence: A Key to Effective Leadership in the First-line Supervisor," *Personnel* 1952. 29:3-11.

Report of a Special Task force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. *Work in America*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 1972.

Roethlisberger, F. J., and Dickson, William J. *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1939.

Sarason, Seymour B. "Jewishness, Blackishness, and the Nature-Nurture Controversy," *American Psychologist* 28 November, 1973, pp. 962-971.

Scott, W. Richard. "Theory of Organizations," *Handbook of Modern Sociology*, ed. R. E. L. Faris. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964, pp. 485-529.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. "Workers (Female) Arise!," *Dissent* Summer, 1974, pp. 380-95.

Sikula, Andrew F. "The Uniqueness of Secretaries as Employees," *Journal of Business Education* 48 Fall, 1973, pp. 203-205.

Stein, Barry A. *Size, Efficiency, and Community Enterprise*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Community Economic Development. 1974.

Sutton, Francis X.; Harris, Seymour E.; Kaysen, Carl; and Tobin, James. *The American Business Creed*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1956.

Taylor, Frederick W. *Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1947.

Tiger, Lionel. *Men in Groups*. New York: Random House. 1969.

Tillett, Anthony; Kempner, Thomas; and Wills, Gordon (eds.). *Management Thinkers*. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books. 1970.

Tresemer, David. "Fear of Success: Popular but Unproven," *Psychology Today* 7 November, 1973.

Uesugi, Thomas K., and Vinacke, W. Edgar. "Strategy in a Feminine Game," *Sociometry* 26, 1963, pp. 35-88.

Vinacke, W. Edgar. "Sex Roles in a Three-person Game," *Sociometry* 22 December, 1959, pp. 343-360.

Wallach, Michael A.; Kogan, Nathan; and Bem, Daryl J. "Group Influence on Individual Risk-taking," *Group Dynamics*, ed. D. Cartwright and A. Zander. New York: Harper & Row, 1968, pp. 430-443.

Warner, W. Lloyd, and Abegglen, James C. *Big Business Leaders in America*. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1955.

Winter, J. Alan. "Elective Affinities between Religious Beliefs and Ideologies of Management in Two Eras," *American Journal of Sociology* 79 March, 1974, pp. 1,134-50.

Wolman, Carol, and Frank, Harold. "The Solo Woman in a Professional Peer Group," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 45: February, 1975.

Zeitlin, Maurice. "Corporate Ownership and Control: The Large Corporation and the Capitalist Class," *American Journal of Sociology* 79 March, 1974, pp. 1,073-1,119.

The Woman or the System: Who Changes Whom?

Sally L. Kitch

Magazines directed toward teen-aged girls in the 1950s and 1960s overflowed with advice about attracting the right young man by being a good listener, finding out about his activities and asking appropriately interesting questions, smiling a lot, and generally trying to fit in with his expectations. As women have entered the male worlds of businesses and the professions, they have heard similar advice: Learn the system from the male point of view and pursue success in male terms.

In many ways, that is not bad advice. Understanding the functioning of the work world and then learning how to operate within that world must be the basis of any woman's career plan. Certainly, concrete and reliable means for obtaining entry into the corporation or the profession must be a very high priority for career-oriented women. But for some of these women that advice alone is disheartening. Even assuming that equity of opportunity and participation will exist someday, for many women the male model of work life and success does not match their views of their own lives, responsibilities, and needs. Such women wonder if alternatives are possible, or if "out-manning" men is the only way to have a successful and rewarding career.

THE PROBLEM

Many women have not experienced the conflict suggested above, but many more are contemplating careers and are seeing a host of difficulties yet to be resolved. Some of their conflicts concern the relationship between work and family responsibilities; some concern questions about the quality of life and the enormous amount of time commitment required to climb traditional career ladders in almost any field. Other conflicts include concern about personal values as they may collide with institutional values, and personality traits and sensitivities which seem inappropriate in the traditional systems of business and professions. For many women, the issue may simply be that their socialization has determined for them a femaleness which appears inappropriate to the maleness of the systems they wish to enter.

BEFORE ANDROGYNY

An ideal which many people have envisioned for our culture is the androgynous person whose personality and life style represent a blending of traits long considered by our culture as exclusively male or exclusively female. Included in this vision is an end to the neurosis created by the suppression of individual traits by an environment which considers them inappropriate. Men in an androgynous society would feel free to express the traditionally non-male feeling of nurturance and weakness, for example. Women would feel free to express the traditionally non-female hostility and feelings of ambition. All persons would feel free to express a range of human feelings and to live a variety of human experiences. Androgyny, for many people, is an ideal hard to resist.

We may, however, need another step before we can reach an androgynous culture. Since our institutions have been dominated by males and reflect male values, we don't have models, other than in the domestic sphere of life, of the acting out of non-male values. We have no experience with what a female-dominated university would be like, for instance. We have done very little extrapolating from the values and experiences of "woman's place" as they might affect "man's place" on a large scale. We do have the

individual experiences of women who have achieved in business and professions, and we do know that individual women have adapted in a variety of ways to the "system." What might be interesting, however, is to consider what kinds of influences might be present if we examined some of what we know about the traditional female experience and then imagined the values which might emerge in the world of work.

A better term for the values and experiences being discussed here might be "non-male" rather than "female," for they are characterized more by their absence from male-dominated institutions than by their presence in women. Indeed, there is no unified female code or set of values or experiences, except perhaps in the minds of some males who wish to exclude women from the world they have claimed for themselves. Through much effort and support from other women, many women, in fact, have learned to redefine themselves, to evaluate their lives, to determine their priorities, and to discover their strengths, their compatibility with other women, their own ambitions and ability to be independent in the determination of their own lives. One question is whether or not there is indeed anything in the non-male subculture that women can and will choose to retain and use as they achieve full participation in business and professions.

THE "NON-MALE" SUBCULTURE

Several discernable aspects of a "non-male" value system can be isolated and inspected. For instance, many recent feminist writers and researchers have noted that part of the traditional female socialization experience is that development of an awareness of the context of human activity. Elizabeth Janeway recently noted this characteristic as women's trained attention to the physical environment in which people work and play.[1] Women's attention to context is not surprising since many women are taught to be concerned with homes, care of clothing, and other items and aspects in their immediate environment. But the learning produced by this domestic training has additional consequences. Caring about the environment of the home or office is part of caring about the comfort and pleasure of the people who will inhabit those spaces. Such caring may be the result, as Janeway points out, of being dependent on the whim of another person for support.[2] In any case, concern for context is a way of attending to relationships at work and at home, and in order to attend to these human needs successfully, a kind of radar about people's feelings is required. The fact that all kinds of men and women with very different personalities and backgrounds have developed this radar, this sensitivity to human needs, and this ability to provide comfort and pleasure, argues for the "teachability" of what we have called intuition, once considered simply an inborn trait, especially of females. If allowed to develop in all persons, the intuitive, sensitive approach to relationships and interpersonal interactions could operate beyond the office birthday party to the highest levels of administrative decision making.

At least one feminist thinker has gone a step further to say that attention to relationships is the central concern of many women. Anne Wilson Schaef identifies a female system (although not all females live it) in which the world is seen not in terms of tasks or self-development but in terms of relationships with important others. The male system, on the other hand, as she points out, has as its center a combination of work and self. For males in that system, self and work are the same: man is what he does.[3]

---

[1] Elizabeth Janeway, lecture at "Why Women's Studies? A Conference," University of Missouri — Columbia, November, 1977.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ann Wilson Schaef, NAWDAC lecture, Denver, Colorado, April, 1977.

Neither system produces the perfect life, but this focus on relationships may well serve to distinguish many women from their male colleagues. Perhaps the systems have something to teach each other. What is to be feared, however, is a world in which everyone becomes what he or she does for a living,and useful non-male values are overwhelmed or lost. If women have, indeed, been acting out their non-male world for men, as they abandon traditional activities and spheres, there may be no one acting out that traditional world.

One possible result of the difference in systems is the likelihood that women will define themselves in terms not only of what they do but of their relationships as well. Sometimes women may see only the relationships, to the exclusion of their own identities. But even if that doesn't occur, multiple relationships often require that women play multiple roles, and while a woman may want to complain about conflicts among the roles, she may also see a diversity of possibilities which the roles produce. This part of the non-male experience also has its hazards. Multiple roles often contribute to feelings of being scattered and unfocused. If role complexity were an acceptable or even an honored feature of men's and women's self-concepts, however, those hazards might be reduced; and if role complexity did not entail role conflict, perhaps many men and women would choose it over the more narrow, career-only definition of self, modeled by the traditional male pattern. Meanwhile, part-time work, flex-time, performance contracts, and limited career paths are options which might reduce role conflict and enrich life for both men and women.

The non-male subculture may also provide an increased appreciation of life as a process instead of a product. Although our society has not yet found a way to reward people for the beauty of their lives or the rhythm of their activities, as we face shrinking resources and markets and new definitions of progress, which may not include endless streams of goods, we may have to consider such rewards for those who work with skill and beauty and develop their talents, thereby increasing the value and quality of their work rather than the quantity only. Some Japanese businesses have implemented a system in which seniority (individual rank) is separated from status (hierarchical position). The individual is rewarded for increasing skills and improving work performance by being given increases in privileges, salary, and respect, rather than by being promoted out of a particular job to a more prestigious position.[4] Such job development might increase work satisfaction without pressuring the individual to assume more responsibility and to devote more and more time to the job throughout the career path. And the emphasis on the quality and process of creation would change the social definition of success. Success might ultimately become a quality measure rather than a quantity measure.

To some extent all people, males and females, have encountered these aspects of the human experience; but they have not been recognized in the male world as important metaphors for what goes on there. The sports metaphor, "...sports — the games boys play and men follow" has.[5] The language of sports as an assumed shared experience among males has determined the strategies and policies of businesses, professions, and even governments. Few non-male values or shared experiences have shaped so much of the world.

---

[4]Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation* (New York: Basic Books, Inc.), 1977, pp. 272-3.

[5]Margaret Hennig and Anne Jardim, *The Managerial Woman* (Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday), 1977, pp. 20-2.

73

FROM DICHOTOMY TO CONTINUUM

The same dualistic thinking which has separated the male and non-male value systems has operated to separate the work and non-work world in our society. Efficiency and tradition have demanded that what is defined as male cannot also be female; what is work cannot also be non-work, whether one defines non-work as play, social activity, or personal life. At least part of the difficulty which people who have not been brought up as males in the male system of values face when they enter the male world is the discomfort they cause themselves and others by their very unfamiliarity within that world.[5] They alter the landscape, and they remind the others of another world, perhaps deep within themselves or perhaps totally strange to them.

What we may lose in efficiency when the dualities of male and non-male values and activities exist, we will gain in increased utilization of skills and talents where they are sorely needed. And we also gain a change in the hierarchy of values.

An alternative to the work/life duality may be the work-life continuum, which assumes a flow from activity to activity. A continuum offers an integration of responsibilities and functions from one "sphere" to another, and a definition of people according to their multiple functions and personalities rather than according to a narrow, uni-dimensional view.

In current practice, a person with multiple roles may suffer in a hierarchical system of values which places one role below another, and may feel conflict and resentment. A society based on a continuum between work and life, on the alternation of activities, on the integration of social and corporate values and responsibilities, with varying patterns for varying life styles among the individuals participating in the system, would ease the frustration. The continuum notion would spread the responsibility for the nurturance of our society among those who also have responsibility for the maintenance of its institutions, tasks, economic growth, and political policies.

On the other hand, assumptions about women's multiple roles can create a female ghetto within male institutions. The recognition of shared female experiences can work against women. There is often the expectation that all women in the organization will automatically take care of housekeeping, charitable, and human relations functions. This expectation not only abuses individual differences and preferences among women, but also perpetuates the hierarchy of values which places achievement, competition, and success above intuition, relationships, and nurturance. Women should not be placed in charge of the "female" value system within the organization. It is the obligation of the workplace to obliterate the dual system which either denigrates and ignores the values which women may bring with them as they enter it or assigns the acting out of those values to women only. The values and lessons of women's socialization must be infused into the values of the corporation, professions, and laboratories of our society, and not by women alone.

THE SYSTEM MOVES

There is some evidence that the process of values adjustment which we have been discussing, as an infusion of traditionally female values into a male system, has already begun for some males. Herbert Shepard has pointed out that management practices are in the process of changing in response not only to the women's movement, but also to the realization that the values of the past have become dysfunctional in the success of organizations. Competition has been replaced with problem solving, col-

[5] Elizabeth Janeway, *Between Myth and Morning: Women Awakening* (New York: William Morrow & Co., Inc.), 1974, p. 48.

laboration, and commitment to the success of colleagues. New skills of resolving conflict, extending and earning trust, personalizing relationships, and sharing resources are now requirements for successful administration. Control as aggressiveness and domination has been replaced by control as an aspect of open, responsive communication.[7] Carolyn Bird has pointed out that the Harvard Business School is now teaching its male students what women have known all along — that collaboration and trust are better motivators than control and correction.[8]

Perhaps the work-life continuum, in which values and activities flow from one sphere to the other, is simply the continuation of a process already begun. Perhaps our society and its institutions are ready for a wider acceptance and use of the non-male experience. If so, then the possibilities for change are even brighter, and the entry of women on a large scale into responsible leadership positions will be a change for the better in an already restless and searching system.

---

[7]Herbert A. Shepard, "Men in Organizations: Some Reflections," in *Beyond Sex Roles*, Alice Sargent (ed.) (St. Paul: West Publishing Company), 1977, pp. 392-3.

[8]Carolyn Bird group discussion, Pioneers for Century III Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio, April, 1976.

Toward a Woman-Centered University

Adrienne Rich

There are two ways in which a woman's integrity is likely to be undermined by the process of university education. This education is, of course, yet another stage in the process of her entire education, from her earliest glimpses of television at home to the tracking and acculturating toward "femininity" that become emphatic in high school. But when a woman is admitted to higher education — particularly graduate school — it is often made to sound as if she enters a sexually neutral world of "disinterested" and "universal" perspectives. It is assumed that coeducation means the equal education, side by side, of women and men. Nothing could be further from the truth; and nothing could more effectively seal a woman's sense of her secondary value in a man-centered world than her experience as a "privileged" woman in the university — if she knows how to interpret what she lives daily.

In terms of the *content* of her education, there is no discipline that does not obscure or devalue the history and experience of women as a group. What Otto Rank said of psychology has to be said of every other discipline, including the "neutral" sciences: it is "not only man-made...but masculine in its mentality." Will it seem, in 40 years, astonishing that a book should have been written in 1946 with the title *Woman as Force in History*? Mary Beard's title does not seem bizarre to us now. Outside of women's studies, though liberal male professors may introduce material about women into their courses, we live with textbooks, research studies, scholarly sources, and lectures that treat women as a subspecies, mentioned only as peripheral to the history of men. In every discipline where we *are* considered, women are perceived as the objects rather than the originators of inquiry, thus primarily through male eyes, thus as a special category.

That the true business of civilization has been in the hands of men is the lesson absorbed by every student of the traditional sources. How this came to be, and the process that kept it so, may well be the most important question for the self-understanding and survival of the human species; but the extent to which civilization has been built on the bodies and services of women — unacknowledged, unpaid, and unprotested in the main — is a subject apparently unfit for scholarly decency. The witch persecutions of the 14th through 17th centuries, for example, involved one of the great historic struggles — a class struggle and a struggle for knowledge — between the illiterate but practiced female healer and the beginnings of an aristocratic nouveau science, between the powerful patriarchal Church and enormous numbers of peasant women, between the pragmatic experience of the wise-woman and the superstitious practices of the early male medicine.

The phenomena of woman-fear and woman-hatred illuminated by these centuries of gynocide are with us still; certainly a history of psychology or history of science that was not hopelessly one-sided would have to confront and examine this period and its consequences. Like the history of slave revolts, the history of women's resistance to domination awaits discovery by the offspring of the dominated. The chronicles, systems, and investigations of the humanities and the sciences are in fact a collection of

Reprinted with permission of the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. The Chronicle of Higher Education and McGraw-Hill. Copyright 1975.

half-truths and lacunae that have worked enormous damage to the ability of the sexes to understand themselves and one another.

If this is changing within the rubric of women's studies, it is doing so in the face of prejudice, contempt, and outright obstruction. If it is true that the culture recognized and transmitted by the university has been predominantly white Western culture, it is also true that within black and Third World studies the emphasis is still predominantly masculine, and the female perspective needs to be fought for and defended there as in the academy at large.

I have been talking about the content of the university curriculum, that is, the mainstream of the curriculum. Women in colleges where a women's-studies program already exists, or where feminist courses are beginning to be taught, still are often made to feel that the "real" curriculum is the male-centered one; that women's studies are (like Third World studies) a "fad"; that feminist teachers are "unscholarly," "unprofessional," or "dykes." But the content of courses and programs is only the more concrete form of undermining experienced by the woman student. More invisible, less amenable to change by committee proposal or fiat, are the hierarchical image, the structure of relationships, even the style of discourse, including assumptions about theory and practice, ends and means, process and goal.

The university is above all a hierarchy. At the top is a small cluster of highly paid and prestigious persons, chiefly men, whose careers entail the services of a very large base of ill-paid or unpaid persons, chiefly women: wives, research assistants, secretaries, teaching assistants, cleaning women, waitresses in the faculty club, lower-echelon administrators, and women students who can be used in various ways to gratify the ego. Each of these groups of women sees itself as distinct from the others, as having different interests and a different destiny. The student may become a research assistant, mistress, or even wife; the wife may act as secretary or personal typist for her husband, or take a job as lecturer or minor administrator; the graduate student may, if she demonstrates unusual brilliance and carefully follows the rules, rise higher into the pyramid, where she loses her identification with teaching fellows, as the wife forgets her identification with the student or secretary she may once have been.

The waitress or cleaning woman has no such mobility, and it is rare for other women in the university, beyond a few socially aware or feminist students, to support her if she is on strike or unjustly fired. Each woman in the university is defined by her relationship to the men in power instead of her relationship to other women up and down the scale.

Now, this fragmentation among women is merely a replication of the fragmentation from each other that women undergo in the society outside; in accepting the premise that advancement and security — even the chance to do one's best work — lie in propitiating and identifying with men who have some power, we have always found ourselves in competition with each other and blinded to our common struggles. This fragmentation and the invisible demoralization it generates work constantly against the intellectual and emotional energies of the woman student.

The hidden assumptions on which the university is built comprise more than simply a class system. In a curious and insidious way the "work" of a few men — especially in the more scholarly and prestigious institutions — becomes a sacred value in whose name emotional and economic exploitation of women is taken for granted. The distinguished professor may understandably like comfort and even luxury and his ego require not merely a wife and secretary but an *au pair* girl, teaching assistant, program-

mer, and student mistress; but the justification for all this service is the almost religious concept of "his work." (Those few women who rise to the top of their professions seem in general to get along with less, to get their work done along with the cooking, personal laundry, and mending without the support of a retinue.)

In other words, the structure of the man-centered university constantly reaffirms *the use of women as means* to the end of male "work"— meaning male careers and professional success. Professors of Kantian ethics or Marxist criticism are no more exempt from this exploitation of women than are professors of military science or behavioral psychology. In its very structure, then, the university encourages women to continue perceiving themselves as means and not as ends — as indeed their whole socialization has done.

It is sometimes pointed out that because the majority of women working in the university are in lower-status positions, the woman student has few if any "role models" she can identify with in the form of women professors or even high-ranking administrators. She therefore can conceive of her own future only in terms of limited ambitions. But it should be one of the goals of a woman-centered university to do away with the pyramid itself, insofar as it is based on sex, age, color, class, and other irrelevant distinctions.

I have been trying to think of a celebrated literary utopia written by a woman. The few contenders would be contemporary: Monique Wittig's *Les Guerilleres* — but that is really a vision of epic struggle, or Elizabeth Gould Davis's early chapters in *The First Sex* — but those are largely based on Bachofen. Shulamith Firestone noted the absence of a female utopia in *The Dialectic of Sex* and proceeded, in the last chapter, to invent her own. These thoughts occur because any vision of things-other-than-as-they-are tends to meet with the charge of "utopianism," so much power has the way-things-are to denude and impoverish the imagination. Even minds practiced in criticism of the status quo resist a vision so apparently unnerving as that which foresees an end to male privilege and a changed relationship between the sexes. The university I have been trying to imagine does not seem to me utopian, though the problems and contradictions to be faced in its actual transformation are of course real and severe. For a long time, academic feminists, like all feminists, are going to have to take personal risks — of confronting their own realities, of speaking their minds, of being fired or ignored when they do so, of becoming stereotyped as "man-haters" when they evince a primary loyalty to women. They will also encounter opposition from successful women who have been the token "exceptions." This opposition — this female misogyny — is a leftover of a very ancient competitiveness and self-hatred forced on women by patriarchal culture. What is now required of the fortunate exceptional women are the modesty and courage to see why and how they have been fortunate at the expense of other women, and to begin to acknowledge their community with them. As Susan Sontag has written:

> The first responsibility of a "liberated" woman is to lead the fullest, freest, and most imaginative life she can. The second responsibility is her solidarity with other women. She may live and work and make love with men. But she has no right to represent her situation as simpler, or less suspect, or less full of compromises than it really is. Her good relations with men must not be bought at the price of betraying her sisters.

To this I would add that from a truly feminist point of view these two responsibilities are inseparable.

I am curious to see what corresponding risks and self-confrontations men of intelligence and goodwill will be ready to undergo on behalf of women. It is one thing to have a single "exceptional" woman as your wife, daughter, friend, or protégé, or to long for a humanization of society by women; another to face each feminist issue — academic, social, personal — as it appears and to evade none. Many women who are not "man-haters" have felt publicly betrayed time and again by men on whose good faith and comradeship they had been relying on account of private conversations. I know that academic men are now hard pressed for jobs and must fear the competition of women entering the university in greater numbers and with greater self-confidence. But masculine resistance to women's claims for full humanity is far more ancient, deeply rooted, and irrational than this year's job market. Misogyny should itself become a central subject of inquiry rather than continue as a desperate clinging to old, destructive fears and privileges. It will be interesting to see how many men are prepared to give more than rhetorical support today to the sex from which they have, for centuries, demanded and accepted so much.

If a truly universal and excellent network of child care can begin to develop, if women in sufficient numbers pervade the university at all levels — from community programs through college and professional schools to all ranks of teaching and administration — if the older, more established faculty women begin to get in touch with their (always, I am convinced) latent feminism, if even a few men come forward willing to think through and support feminist issues beyond their own immediate self-interest, there is a strong chance that in our own time we would begin to see some true "universality" of values emerging from the inadequate and distorted corpus of patriarchal knowledge. This will mean not a renaissance but a *nascence*, partaking of some inheritances from the past but working imaginatively far beyond them.

It is likely that in the immediate future various alternatives will be explored. Women's studies programs, where they are staffed by feminists, will serve as a focus for feminist values even in a patriarchal context. Even where staffed largely by tokenists, their very existence will make possible some rising consciousness in students. Already, alternate feminist institutes are arising to challenge the curriculum of established institutions. Feminists may use the man-centered university as a base and resource while doing research and writing books and articles whose influence will be felt far beyond the academy. Consciously woman-centered universities — in which women shape the philosophy and the decision making though men may choose to study and teach there — may evolve from existing institutions. Whatever the forms it may take, the process of women's repossession of ourselves is irreversible. Within and without academe, the rise in women's expectations has gone far beyond the middle class and has released an incalculable new energy — not merely for changing institutions but for human redefinition; not merely for equal rights but for a new kind of being.

Men over Forty, Women under Forty

Carolyn G. Heilbrun

The power to change the frightful imbalance of the sexes in the faculties of our institutions of higher education rests, I believe, with the two groups least likely, at first blush, to offer hope for that change: men over and women under 40. Inspiring these two groups to action is certainly uphill work. I am reminded of the Vermont farmer who, asked for directions, replied: "If I wanted to get where you're going, I wouldn't start from here." Here, nonetheless, we are.

Why these two groups? Why not, for example, the group to which I belong: academic women, mostly tenured, 40 and over?

I can only state bluntly that this group of older women of achievement must be counted out. While there are marked exceptions, as in every characterization of groups, older academic women appear to exist in an irreversible state of fear in the presence of their male colleagues.

Women now under 40, however complacent about enjoying what has been won for them, did not grow up as slaves. Doris Lessing has told us that slaves, set free, "are marked by the habits of submission; and slaves imagining freedom see it through the eyes of slaves." There are many explanations for older women's failure of courage, and I hope one day to identify and describe them, but this much is clear: Established academic women will not offend the male club which has initiated them.

As to men under 40, if they can discover ways to survive in the shrinking academic world, and to live with women without dehumanizing themselves, that is all that can be asked of them, and it is enough.

Men over 40, in whose hands all power lies, are the conservatives of the academic world. A conservative is one who, in defense of principles he considers imperative, can bear with equanimity the sufferings of others. We are all in some ways conservative, but complete conservatism and absolute power are a dangerous combination. I suspect that, for many reasons, older academic men are now subtly aware of this, and that that awareness can be encouraged. (I remind myself that the harshest penalty for naïveté is to look a fool.)

There is another characteristic of this group, little noticed and less commented upon, which they share with other successful men of their age: They are at that point in life when the self grows restless and asks, Is this all there is? Freud had his work cut out for him exploring the unconscious of infancy, and his followers have paid little attention to the crises (or, as Gail Sheehy calls them, the "passages") of middle age. Colleges and universities are being run by men as unconsciously sick of power as women are of powerlessness. It is, moreover, being continually affirmed that the feminine selves in males (like the masculine selves in women) become, in middle age, adamant and persistent in their demand for expression. Of course, the average head of a department (think of one!) would sooner admit to plagiarism than to a feminine self. Nonetheless, that powerful male in crisis, although he appears as arrogant as ever, may, given a face-saving way to change, be tempted toward uncharacteristic

Reprinted with permission of the Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, The Chronicle of Higher Education, and the author. Copyright 1977.

actions if these can be shown to be sternly practical.

What might these practical actions be?

First, those prestigious institutions that set the style for the profession might stop trading back and forth the few "acceptable" women professors and administrators. There is one woman professor who must have had more offers of alliance in the last decade than Elizabeth I had in her whole lifetime. Male professors and administrators appear to have one criterion of achievement: Would Harvard hire her/him?

By the time those in search for tenured women have eliminated women who will not move, and those who are suspected of feminism (such a woman is often called a "women's libber"), they are ready to declare that, of course they haven't enough tenured women, but suitable candidates (sad to admit) just aren't available. Every study tells us where these women are: in the less prestigious institutions, where they are usually being marvelously competent and gaining valuable experience. Since the less prestigious the institution, the more women it has, the source of trained women is obvious. Think of farm clubs, think of the minor leagues. As to the feminism of these women, is it really that dangerous? In fact, the few frankly feminist women with tenure, in or out of prestigious institutions, are so endangered a species as to interest a zoo.

Second, so-called women's or gender studies are the fastest, perhaps the only, growing academic pursuit in a dreary world. Even some men are teaching these courses, or trying to. Instead of treating this whole subject as a duchess would treat a dog who not only got into the drawing room but made a mess on the hearth rug, why not recognize it for its sheer money-making, scholarly, growth possibilities? No academic field, outside of those sciences whose chief characteristic is their purity, cannot be seen in a new way if every aspect of femininity, or what has hitherto been defined or ignored as femininity, is explored. The whole question of human cognition is now being challenged: Piaget, for example, considered only logical rationality in his pioneering work. Was this too limited? Male administrators, scrounging for funds, must not ignore this source simply because they find it not quite nice.

Third, the largest group of potential students is no longer the 18- to 22-year-olds. Many of the snootiest universities have more non-matriculated than matriculated students, although they are careful not to tell their alumni. This group consists of women and men wearied of stereotyped male pursuits. Courses must be geared to their needs: not made simpler, but less rigid and less authoritarian. Women are those most likely to possess the skills for devising centers and programs for people who wish to study after adolescence or even middle age.

Fourth, chairmen might stop telling every man who is not hired that affirmative action forced the hiring of a woman instead. It is a lie, and if it soothes the disappointed male applicant, it is no less evil or harmful for that. Even with all the unemployment around, one rarely meets, these days, a man turned down for any other reason.

Finally, male administrators must allow themselves to recognize that large numbers of their students, graduate and undergraduate, are women. Can men in power be absolutely confident that women students will continue to pay high fees to be taught exclusively (with only a few token exceptions) by men?

Which brings us to my second group, women under 40 — often way under, since I include students as well as faculty members. *The Chronicle* reported in April that a woman student at Brown had said: "Activism is considered a male thing. Most women don't run for office. A lot of women are afraid to be labeled feminist."

How does one counter the fear of being labeled feminist? I have recently thrown out a collection of clippings from the *New York Times* (it had grown so large that either it or I had to go) of accounts of women who had made the greatest advances in centuries. They had entered the military academies, taken jobs down mines and up mountains, joined Papa in father-daughter firms, started businesses, deserted tired marriages, and joined formerly all-male boards. One and all, they announced that, of course, they were *not feminist*. They just wanted to live their own lives.

Everything in a female's life encourages her to believe that any struggle for self-assertion will result in her abandonment, her isolation from male approval. This fear has been avoided by only a few exceptional women, most of them now assistant professors, little more than a decade older than the students they must now encourage. Often teaching women's or gender studies, they risk losing possible promotion in being frankly feminist. My faith in these assistant professors is great, for they were formed in the sixties, that decade which, to be sure, promised more than it gave, but which did teach us that powerful conservatism can be overturned by the persistent efforts of the apparently powerless.

Yet this generation of women assistant professors will find itself an isolated event in history, like their suffragette forebears, if they cannot cultivate their natural constituency: the women students in coed or formerly male institutions. They must remind the women students in institutions formerly all male that no special privilege has been conferred upon them in giving them admittance to these hallowed halls. They were taken in because the pools of academically qualified applicants could not be enlarged without them and because they were needed to attract the best male applicants.

These students need not be humbly grateful. On the contrary, they should demand that, if the institutions cannot survive without women students, neither can those students survive without the role models provided by numerous women faculty members.

The same is now true at the graduate level, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. Enrollments in those departments would be disastrously low were it not for the large numbers of women students. These brilliant women are at least half — and, in many departments, the better half — of graduate students, yet there are few women professors in their departments, and those few are underpaid. Women students must learn their own political and economic power, and stop acting like charity children at a Christmas party.

I like to imagine the male chairman and the woman student in dialogue. He, his feet on the desk, cigar in mouth, patronizes her, eager for her money and brains so long as she will let him pontificate and not ask to be his equal, his colleague; she, afraid someone will tell her she is not feminine if she expresses what Virginia Woolf called the manliness of her girlish heart. I like to imagine that suddenly, to him, she is the self he never developed, that self that might have talked without its feet on the desk. And to her, he is the possibility of real selfhood, without, of course, the pomposity.

Can I really be fool enough to hope for change from these two? Remember Matthew Arnold, who spoke of two worlds — one dead, the other powerless to be born? I think he was wrong then, and I think he's wrong now.

Survival Dynamics for Women in Educational Administration

R. Susan Gordon and Patricia G. Ball

Much has been written about women in educational administration, but a quick glance around this country will show that, in higher education, women are generally administering woman-related programs: affirmative action, women's projects, women's colleges. Little has been written or researched, however, to suggest what institutions of higher education are or should be doing to equip women to move upward into the central administrative structure. The recent proliferation of literature about administrative opportunities for women reflects the problems of socialization and stereotyping, the limited access to education and employment opportunities, the lack of affirmative action by educational institutions and the dearth of female role models for women setting their career goals. Even in the face of the present federal legislation we are painfully aware of what institutions are doing to train, recruit and promote capable women into responsible administrative positions. At best, the answer is "not much" and in most cases, a definite "nothing." Over and over studies are showing that women are not gaining ground but, in fact, losing what little gain they have claimed. Peggy Elder warns that

> Indeed, the recent minor changes may lull women and administrators into a complacency which could stifle further increases and permit some to argue in favor of the status quo (Elder, 1975).

The question then becomes, not what are institutions doing for women, but rather what are we as women doing for ourselves and what are we willing to do for each other. Obviously, competence is not enough, but why should that surprise us — it rarely ever is. The "old boy" network has always existed to teach those all-important "informal" ropes of the profession to chosen male protégés: the introductions to professional colleagues, the personal recommendations for fellowships, the intervention for those top job opportunities. Bernice Sandler (1974) suggests that men are often uncomfortable with female students and hence they seldom become protégés. Correspondingly, Judy Long-Laws (1976) espouses the theory that most women who have made it into administration have had male mentors: male colleagues who served to provide those opportunities generally reserved for male protégés.

We, as women in administration, must begin to seek out and provide opportunities for other women, through inservice programming and intern experiences. We must accept the responsibility to recommend and recruit capable women whenever our input is solicited and to speak up with our recommendations when it is not.

Konnilyn Feig says that what we are attempting is the impossible:

> We are trying to change an institution that is in its worst crisis in decades. The characteristics of higher education today must be kept in mind: fear, panic, insecurity....To change that institution, we must plan our strategy around the strongest and most vital motivation present within the walls on the part of most: survival dynamics (Feig, 1973).

Survival dynamics *is* what we are about, and when we get down to the "nitty gritty," that includes national, regional and local workshops to

Reprinted by permission of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors and the authors.

equip women with the strategies as well as the skills for moving into the administrative mainstream.

A thorough understanding of the nature of discrimination as well as the legal means to combat it are vital tools for women seeking administrative roles. Although considerable progress has been made in changing laws, women have not obtained all their legal rights. While numerous laws exist to guarantee these rights including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the 1963 Equal Pay Act; Executive Order 11245, as amended by Executive Order 11375; Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, our problem is educating women and men to the common but subtle aspects of discrimination. They have come to accept discrimination in taxes, credit and wages as well as in employment and educational opportunities.

The idea, for example, that neither women nor men would willingly work under female management is one discriminatory argument used to keep women out of the central administrative hierarchy. Considerable available research suggests that those women and men who have worked for a woman have found the experience to be positive, that women supervisors were inclined to assist both men and women in their efforts to advance, and were more democratic in their administrative practices. This last fact was established in 1966 by a University of Florida Kellogg leadership study team, who found the response so surprising that the researchers carefully checked their work, but the result remained the same (Taylor, 1973).

In defining survival strategies for women in administration, therefore, one goal must be the development of those coping skills which will enable them to respond to dehumanizing behavior in an assertive and intrinsically rewarding manner. This positive, integrative behavior can only emerge as women begin to look within themselves and to other women for support and feedback.

An understanding of the politics of personal power is essential if women are to become effective administrators, to take on the risk, responsibilities and excitement of being autonomous and of having the freedom to shape their individual lives as well as to affect the future of higher education. Recruiting women for high administration positions means changing the status quo, and change is never easy — no less so when it is a challenge to the white, male-dominated power base. Adrienne Rich asserts that the university is above all a hierarchy.

> At the top is a small cluster of highly paid and prestigious persons, chiefly men, whose careers entail the services of a very large base of ill-paid or unpaid persons, chiefly women....In its very structure, then, the university encourages women to continue perceiving themselves as means and not as ends — as indeed their whole socialization has done (Rich, 1975).

Men in administration realize the importance of fiscal control and planning. The fact that women neither realize the importance of working with budget nor seek out budgeting experience is the grown-up version of "girls aren't good at arithmetic." A recent study of women in continuing education administration undertaken by the Association for Continuing Higher Education showed that the majority of women in this area of administration had no responsibility for fiscal planning or personnel supervision (Sisley, 1974).

Women need testing grounds and opportunities to develop their own strategies and skills to administer effectively. *On Campus with Women*, the newsletter of the Project on the Status and Education of Women within the Association of American Colleges, reports that less than five percent of

the colleges and universities in the United States are headed by women, and seventy-five percent of those positions which are held by women are within small church-related institutions (Long-Laws, 1975). Correspondingly, the University Council for Educational Administration survey revealed that only two percent of the faculty responding to their questionnaire were women. Of these 1,333 professors of educational administration, only 24 were women (Cambell & Newell, 1973).

Let us start by providing female mentors. Given the lack of female models in the profession and in the training programs for educational administration, a woman entering higher education generally evaluates her own future in terms of limited ambitions and possibilities. It is the responsibility of those of us who are now on college and university campuses to serve as "mentors," to make sacrifices if necessary to see that opportunities for women begin to become fair, open and equitable — to survive. If that sounds martyred, the truth is, things are not getting better and we can no longer afford to simply sit back and decry the lack of female colleagues, or even worse allow ourselves to fall into the Queen Bee syndrome.

We do not believe that women have to accept the philosophies of administration espoused today by our male-oriented society in order to get ahead. We are all naive, however, if we think we can ever make any headway without our own base of support and power, or insights into and defenses to deal with the arguments and stereotypes which have sought to alienate women from one another.

TWENTY SURVIVAL STRATEGIES YOU CAN START IMMEDIATELY

1. Find out who is responsible for Affirmative Action, EEO and Title IX on your campus. Invite them to lunch or a seminar with other campus women.

2. Enroll in an assertiveness-training group or organize one with other administrative and faculty women. Encourage female students and coworkers to participate in assertiveness training and consciousness raising.

3. Keep yourself posted on professional vacancies on your campus; share this information with other women in your institution as well as at other schools.

4. Give your dean or department head a list of the names and addresses of the women's caucuses within your professional associations. Then follow up when vacancies arise to see that he or she uses it.

5. Join professional organizations and actively participate (hold offices, serve on committees, write articles, develop workshops, attend meetings, volunteer!).

6. Join professional organizations whose primary membership is women in administrative roles (such as the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors or the National Council of Administrative Women in Education).

7. Establish ties with community women's organizations (like NOW, AAUW, League of Women Voters, BPW, and women's centers).

8. Involve yourself in your campus Commission for Women (you need not be a member to attend open meetings, request minutes, express an interest, or respond to an issue).

9. Go to your chancellor, provost or president and express your desire to serve on university committees and/or special projects.

10. Establish a women's caucus on your campus. Intra-institutional communication is important, but also spend time analyzing the power structure and decision-making practices at your university.

11. Find out who new female staff members are each fall and invite them to a women's caucus gathering.

12. Give credit where credit is due, and give support to women in your institution who are challenging the system (headway they make will be your gain also).

13. Blow your own horn to your supervisors — let them know the worthwhile things you are doing and the positive image you are projecting for your division.

14. Support male colleagues who are attempting to promote opportunities for women.

15. Analyze your own working practices with clerical staff to insure that you are not practicing those things you find dehumanizing in the main administrative structure.

16. Work with the College of Education to provide beneficial practicum experiences for graduate women. (Share strategies as well as experiences, and failures as well as successes.) Be open to learn from your students.

17. Share the power — delegate responsibility and involve people in the decision-making process; keep them informed of all the information that is needed to make a decision.

18. Find out when budget planning begins and ask to be included. Attend open hearings on the budget.

19. Be aware of your usage of the generic "he" and begin to change both your writing and speaking to reflect "she/he."

20. Discuss salaries; ask for a salary review. Open discussion of salaries is one way to determine whether women are being treated equitably.

References

Cambeil, R. F., & Newell, L. J. *A study of professors of educational administration*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Elder, P. Women in higher education: Qualified, except for sex. *NASPA Journal*, Fall 1975, 13(2), 9.

Feig, K. Higher education and the woman professional. Unpublished speech given at the University of Georgia conference, "The American woman: Who will she be?" 1973.

Long-Laws, J. Psychology of tokenism: An analysis. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 1975, 1(1), 51.

Long-Laws, J. *On campus with women*, April 1976, 13, 5.

Rich, A. Toward a woman-centered university. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 21, 1975, 32.

Sandler, B. Backlash in academe: A critique of the Lester report. *Teachers College Record*, Fall, 1974, 76(1), 409.

Sisley, R. C., chairperson. 1974 report of the committee on the status of women in higher education. *Proceedings, Association for Continuing Higher Education*, 125.

Taylor, S. S. Educational leadership: A male domain. *Phi Delta Kappan*, October 1973, 55(2), 125.

Contributions to Practice: Organizational Change, Affirmative Action, and the Quality of Work Life

Rosabeth Moss Kanter

The reasonable man adapts himself to the world; the unreasonable one persists in trying to adapt the world to himself. Therefore, all progress depends on the unreasonable man.

— George Bernard Shaw, *Man and Superman*

A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong gives it the superficial appearance of being right.

— Thomas Paine, *Common Sense*

The workplace has long been dominated by the rule of the carrot and the stick — as if we were a nation of donkeys. But the carrot — the lure of material well-being as defined by money and possessions — is subtly losing its savor. And the stick — once a brutal club labelled "economic insecurity" — has thinned down to a flaccid bundle of twigs.

— Daniel Yankelovich, "The Meaning of Work"

Three important concerns converge around the need to change the structures of organizations. First is a growing recognition that improving the quality of work life and considering the human consequences of organizational arrangements are as important a measure of a system's "effectiveness" as economic indicators. This movement reflects a demand on the part of the working population. Opinion polls, though themselves not always the best indicators, have shown a steady erosion in the satisfaction expressed with work since the early 1960s. Daniel Yankelovich points to a cultural *Zeitgeist* in which ever greater numbers of people expect work to involve challenge and meaning as well as opportunities for self-expression.[1] An American Management Association survey of middle management discovered that over half of the respondents found their work "at best, unsatisfying." There is evidence that blocked opportunity and powerlessness affect the work-life quality of managers and professionals along with other workers; in one report, dissatisfaction was growing in middle management as a function of job insecurity, "boxed-in" feelings, and responsibility without authority.[2] Remedies clearly involve organizational changes.

Equal employment opportunity for women and minorities is another currently pressing issue, and one that cannot be solved without attention to the structures of opportunity, power, and numbers. Effective strategies of affirmative action must be based on examination of the design of jobs and their settings. Since women and blacks have legal remedies that disadvantaged white men may lack, the levers are at hand, via this issue, to encourage policymakers to reconsider organizational design; equal em-

Chapter 10, "Contributions to Practice: Organizational Change, Affirmative Action, and the Quality of Work Life," in Men and Women of the Corporation, *by Rosabeth Moss Kanter,* © *1977 by Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York.*

[1]Daniel Yankelovich, "The Meaning of Work," in *The Worker and the Job*, Jerome M. Rosow, ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), pp. 19-47.

[2]On the AMA study: Sam Zagoria, "Policy Implications and Future Agenda," in *The Worker and the Job*, Jerome M. Rosow, ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974), pp. 177-201. On managers' discontents: Emanuel Kay, "Middle Management," in *Work and the Quality of Life*, James O'Toole, ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974), pp. 106-30.

ployment opportunity is a stated policy of the United States government and practically all major organizations. Furthermore, there is a need for change models that do not merely improve the situation of one group at the cost of another, as is often the case now, but rather create more generally satisfying as well as more equitable arrangements. As I have argued earlier, the problem of equality for women cannot be solved without structures that potentially benefit all organization members more broadly.

Finally, organizations themselves should have an interest in effective behavior. Blocked opportunity, powerlessness, and tokenism tend to generate employees who, among other things, have low aspirations, lack commitment to the organization, become hostile to leaders, behave ineffectively in leadership roles themselves, take few risks, or become socially isolated and personally stressed. Aside from the cost to such individuals — often women, but also men — organizations are wasting a large measure of their human talent. Systems that are more generally opportunity- and power-constraining are not developing the resources of either their men or their women to the fullest. Such problems of limited opportunity, limited power, and unbalanced numbers arise especially in large hierarchical organizations. Where rewards and status become increasingly scarce closer to the top, where the gap between "professionals" or administrators and other workers is particularly large, and where rigid bureaucratic models of task organization prevail, there is also likely to be a large group of disadvantaged and underemployed workers. This group can be the source of behavioral blockages and recurrent organizational problems.

What can be done, in policy and practice, about these critical social issues? The analysis of opportunity, power, and numbers provides guidelines for the kinds of programs and arrangements that will broaden access to favorable positions in organizations. The theoretical framework can be used to suggest new structural alternatives, on the one hand, and to provide a conceptual underpinning for better-known strategies, on the other hand — strategies which are currently being applied to some managerial personnel but rarely below. Policies are useful, in this regard, if they *enhance opportunity*, *empower*, and *balance* the *numbers* of socially different kinds of people.

Elements of structural change are outlined in this chapter. Systematic application of these principles, with supporting arrangements in the organization as a whole, has the potential to make a big difference. For example, people who seem to be uncommitted or at the limit of their abilities might take on greater challenge and be more productive, with beneficial consequences to both person and organization. People who seem to be rigid, rules-minded, and hostile to change might, with greater access to power, become more effective and more innovative. But to reap such benefits, thoroughgoing revision of much present organizational practice is required, including job redefinition and redesign, modifications of the hierarchy, and much more flexibility of opportunity structures. In some instances, this means developing new strategies, but it also involves the systematic application of much of what is already known about structural change in organizations. We can combine the integrated approach to organizational behavior contained in the three-variable model with practical policies based on experiences in innovating organizations to suggest some of the elements of opportunity-enhancing, empowering, and number-balancing strategies.

OPPORTUNITY-ENHANCING EFFORTS

Whenever people are concentrated in low-opportunity and low-mobility jobs with few prospects for growth in skills or advancement and few open

pathways out and up, their full participation in the organization is constrained and their involvement in work is limited. While some jobs offer high-mobility prospects to their occupants (a high probability of advancement, a short time-span between advances, the chance for increasing challenge, and eventual access to the most rewarded jobs), other positions systematically block opportunity: promotion rates are low, there is a long time-span between moves, tasks do not change, skill and mastery do not increase, and there is no route out of the job into rewarded positions. Internal allocation of personnel, in a complex organization, is governed by hiring, promotion, and layoff rules within separate "labor markets" or kinds of workplaces (office work, professional areas, management, public relations, etc.). Each workplace also formulates its own definition of "suitability" for its jobs. Thus, one issue is not only to provide advancement for some individuals but also to decrease the gap between labor markets so as to raise the stature of low-mobility occupations as a whole.[3]

To enhance opportunity, the nature of such internal labor markets must first be uncovered and then modified; a thorough review of job ladders and an effort to open new ladders is required. Organizations can also more routinely operate in ways that increase skills and competences required for advancement. At the same time, opportunity can be broadened in other, less hierarchical ways that take into account the imperatives of economic efficiency: that not everyone can be (or wants to be) at the "top," that some undesirable jobs must be done, that monetary rewards may not be infinitely expandable. New structures can reinforce alternatives to definitions of success-as-upward-mobility. Organizations can make more widely available enhancement of skills, movement into new situations, or continuing challenge backed up by recognition.

Opening opportunity for clerical workers is one structural change issue. Because the labor markets and advancement ladders for clerical and managerial personnel are often so different, personnel strategists may have difficulty even in deciding what paths and channels can be opened between these two distinct worlds. What path can a secretary take that would put her on an administrative ladder other than toward clerical supervisor? What kinds of jobs can serve as the links? A system's size and complexity can make such questions difficult to answer. The first requirement is a clear picture of the skills and training required by different jobs, so that it is possible to see whether Job B is an appropriate next step from Job A, despite how different their titles and content areas might make them sound; *bridges between job ladders* can be identified. But even before opportunities can be created, then, the organization must acquire information and find a way to make comparisons across technical, clerical, and lower-management jobs. If, as is often the case, many clerical positions have no job descriptions or non-ad-hoc way of discovering or evaluating what the skills of people in those positions actually are, a first step might involve diagnosis: sending a team of people into the field to interview clerical or other low-opportunity workers and write *job descriptions*. These descriptions should include a list of the actual tasks performed and, therefore, identification of *competences* needed rather than a title for the overall function, and they should outline the special content knowledge acquired in the job. They should particularly include any special opportunities offered by the job to move beyond the limits of the formal title (such as typist) and exercise special skills (such as budget writing).

[3]Peter B. Doeringer and Michael J. Piore, *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1971). On individual mobility versus occupational inequality, see Christopher Jencks, et al., *Inequality* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 196-99.

A next step is the establishment of good feedback and encouragement for learning, as in a *performance-appraisal system* in which managers and subordinates or groups of work peers and colleagues would periodically meet to review the individuals' performances, suggest areas for improvement, note areas that were outstanding, and record any changes in the skill levels of the employees since the last meeting, such as new proficiencies or educational experiences. Some analysts recommend frequent *work-planning and review meetings* as an alternative to less frequent performance appraisals.

Both of these steps have some opportunity-enhancing aspects by themselves. The people involved are encouraged by such processes to see themselves and their jobs in a different way. Going through the process can boost self-esteem and build people's sense of their own skills. Some can see that they did not just occupy a particular niche for which they were suited in some general and vague way, but rather that they possessed a number of quite specific competences that resembled the skills called for in jobs up the ladder. Where the appraisal interaction between manager and subordinate or within a peer group works as it is planned, *managers* can be seen *as counseling resources*, helping employees decide how to improve their skills and transform "just a job" into a step in a conscious career. This requires managers who are trained in "people-development skills," as discussed below, and who are rewarded by the organization for the development of talent rather than such usual bureaucratic outcomes as conformity to rules.

The opportunity-enhancing features of performance appraisal appear to require formal planning, for there is evidence that even those who think it is a good idea would rarely undertake it on their own.[4] Assessment of competence is certainly an emotionally charged issue, for all parties involved. And performance appraisal can also be abused: when it is used for control (e.g., to justify low pay or firings) rather than to increase opportunity; when bosses who are ineffective communicators evaluate judgmentally rather than analyze capacities in a helpful way, focus on personality rather than performance, or fail to report performance accurately out of fears that their own competence as a manager will be called into question; or when the data are used for peer comparisons, to determine how to distribute a scarce pool of rewards, and people are inappropriately fitted to a curve.[5] But as part of a program to increase the development of human talent and, hence, boost opportunity, systems of performance appraisal can be useful.

At the same time that women and other typically low-mobility workers can come to see themselves, through the job-description and performance-appraisal process, as more mobile and "marketable" than they had thought, the organization itself will now have a *pool of information* on the skills and talents of employees to whom little attention had previously been paid. Some of the information can be surprising, revealing a suitability for promotion or more challenging responsibilities that might not become known otherwise. In addition to the increase of information, the employees themselves might be increasing in skill as a result of the changed context

[4]Herbert H. Meyer, Emanuel Kay, and John R. P. French, Jr., "Split Roles in Performance Appraisal," *Harvard Business Review*, 43 (January-February 1965).

[5]Paul H. Thompson and Gene W. Dalton, "Performance Appraisal: Managers Beware," *Harvard Business Review*, 48 (January-February 1970); Alan L. Patz, "Performance Appraisal: Useful but Still Resisted," *Harvard Business Review*, 53 (May-June 1975), pp. 74-80. There are a variety of other problems with appraisal systems that involve measurement: problems of quantification, ambiguity, validity, reliability across bosses, weighting of performance areas, and "halo effects" whereby generally good or generally bad impressions are generalized to all areas.

of opportunity. At this point, *career-review* processes can be helpful. Managers and subordinates, or employees and personnel specialists, or colleague groups, discuss employees' ultimate career goals and help them to map a series of steps by which they can (a) improve current performance; (b) acquire the additional skills, education, or training necessary to meet their career goals; and (c) look for the appropriate pathway — the sequence of jobs — that will move them toward their goal. Sometimes this can involve inventing a job that does not yet exist, and it can be an important source of innovation for an organization.

Change should not stop here. To lengthen some ladders for blocked-opportunity people on paper and to identify the hidden talent among employees while encouraging them in their learning still does not guarantee that opportunity has really been opened or that the "next step" does not itself turn out to be a dead end. *Job posting* provides one form of insurance: a system by which openings are announced publicly and employees are free to bid on any job. But the nature of certain jobs and their role relations should also be reexamined.

Since women are often concentrated in dead-end secretarial positions, secretarial work is one example of a fruitful area for *job redesign*, in a number of ways. If a secretary's status is based on that of her boss, these statuses should be decoupled so that secretaries are rewarded for what they actually do and not for how senior the boss is. Secretaries could also become apprentices to their bosses, and part of bosses' responsibilities (for which they themselves would be evaluated) would be to teach secretaries enough over a period of time that they could move ahead on management ladders. Again, managers could be officially rewarded for developing talent and losing good secretaries in contrast to their present systematic stake in keeping one as long as possible in the same position. If more work in large organizations begins to take place in project teams and committees, secretaries could more readily be viewed as part of the team rather than a note-taking adjunct, especially when they could have as much as or more information than managers by virtue of reading correspondence and talking with other secretaries. This sometimes occurs informally at present, but there are several problems with informal arrangements. They continue to leave secretaries dependent on the whim and approval of bosses to get training or team membership, they do not permit offical recognition of what secretaries are learning and doing, and they do not include such opportunities as regular features of the job so that the next role occupant lacks comparable opportunities. However, to formalize an apprentice or assistant status for secretaries and then enlarge also the training and autonomy of pool typists in preparation for apprenticeships would increase mobility prospects associated with secretarial jobs. It would increase the number of men seeking them. It would also reduce some of the typical "office wife" features of the job. There would be better uses of secretarial time. Secretaries would have to be chosen for intellectual and managerial abilities. They would have opportunities to demonstrate competence and win the respect of a wider audience. And bosses would have to see them as potential peers.

In addition to the redesign of typical jobs for women to add more opportunity to them, it is important to *develop new jobs* that close the gap between different internal labor markets. Wherever the gap between a higher-status category of work and lower-status function is great, so that there is rarely any movement from the lower to the higher, or from one internal labor market to another, the gap needs to be bridged by a sequence of ever more highly skilled jobs that could gradually move employees in the

lower-status positions into eligibility for the higher status. For example, this could involve gradually adding functions and competence to clerical workers until they were operating like managers and seen as capable of taking on the higher-level job. The development of paraprofessionals to work with highly trained professionals is one instance of the design of new jobs. Such intermediate positions act as bridges as well as ensure a fuller utilization of human talent.

A second set of opportunity-related problems occurs for higher-level as well as lower-level employees. Blocked opportunity is an almost inevitable problem for some people in pyramidal, hierarchical organizations, where the scarcity of places on mobility ladders increases with each step up and where there is a demand for large numbers of low-paid personnel at the bottom. In other words, there is not enough room for everyone at the top. Some people have to do the less desirable jobs, and some of those in the desirable jobs reach dead ends, too. In an extreme instance of a new organization model, the Israeli kibbutzim have tried to solve such problems by rotating all management positions so that after a certain number of years at the top, people give up their places and go back to lower-level positions.[6] There are variants of this practice in American business and professional organizations: temporary assignments, "flow-through" jobs, academic departments that rotate the chair, loans of managers to outside organizations.

Job rotation could be increased and extended throughout the system, and creative plans could be worked out by innovative organizations willing to experiment. Job rotation helps break down the parochialism of many bureaucrats, such as those in dead-end or powerless positions prone to concern with territorial control, and it builds commitment to the organization as a whole, as I found in my studies of long-lived utopian communities.[7] And, of course, many executives already "rotate" jobs. Even if it is unrealistic to imagine in the corporate or governmental context that job rotation schemes could really work to reduce the opportunity gap between high-mobility and low-mobility jobs, they could help to redefine opportunity as involving lateral as well as vertical moves, as a change in territory offering new potential for growth and learning rather than only a change in status or span of authority. Although hierarchy restricts the number of vertical opportunities, the number of lateral prospects remains high. One company appears to have successfully avoided layoffs (thus enhancing job security as well as opportunity) through a program of encouraging "career bends": posting job openings and offering extensive retraining for people to move into new fields.[8]

Project management, an organizational strategy that involves the creation of temporary teams for particular tasks, teams that cut across departments and even hierarchical levels, is one already viable option. Although much routine work might need to be permanently assigned in fixed departments, non-routine work can be given to short-term project teams whose members

---

[6]The kibbutz model is interesting in a number of respects, for it represents a successful attempt to manage industry as well as agriculture on a communal basis. See, for example, Menachem Rosner, "Direct Democracy in the Kibbutz," in *Communes: Creating and Managing the Collective Life*, R. M. Kanter, ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), pp. 178-91. There are also descriptions of the kibbutz organization of work in Arnold Tannenbaum, et al., *Hierarchy in Organizations: An International Comparison* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1974), David French and Elena French, *Working Communally* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1974).

[7]Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Commitment and Community* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), especially pp. 95-97 and 236.

[8]"How IBM Avoids Layoffs through Retraining," *Business Week*, November 10, 1975, pp. 110-12.

spend part of their time on their ongoing tasks and part on the project. (Consulting organizations typically work in this fashion.) Even if the routine tasks do not change, the opportunity to make lateral moves — that is, to be involved in a series of challenging projects — can create a definition of success as consisting in ever-increasing learning experiences and new fields to master — an expansion of personal horizons. Opportunity can mean access to growth and learning as well as promotions. Project organization offers the option of a view of the rewards in work stemming from new adventures and new challenges rather than the long climb to the "top." And it is clear that alternative definitions of success are long overdue. Careerism is not everything, and it contains its own dysfunctions in overwork and family neglect. Organizations must learn other ways to reward people and provide a sense of growth, movement, progress, and value. This is especially important when, as I saw at Indsco, an organization appears to promise more promotions than it can deliver.

One useful alternative to Western definitions of "success" as vertical mobility exists in Japan. Large Japanese organizations distinguish between individual rank (seniority) and hierarchical position (status), an arrangement that permits continuing growth in recognition and rewards (as seniority increases) even when the individual's vertical mobility is low and promotion infrequent.[9] Of course, unions do a somewhat similar thing in the United States by tying certain benefits and raises to seniority rather than performance, but the Japanese model includes a wider range of rewards, including increased respect and privileges with age and rank regardless of job status.

At the same time, jobs could be viewed in terms of advances in skill rather than in status and "level," a growth orientation like that of crafts people. "Mobility" can mean becoming more skilled, getting better at what one is doing, and being rewarded appropriately for the increase in competence. For this meaning of opportunity to make a difference, however, jobs need to be designed so as to involve creativity and skills — a task for programs of *job enrichment*.[10] It is hard to take pride in dull, routine work, or to gain a sense of mastery and growth when no challenge is involved. Adding a succession of *challenges* as signs of "promotion" or "advance," instead of jumps in privilege and control, could be a way of opening opportunity for women and others at the bottom and redefining it more humanely for those at the top. Richard Walton reported successful experiments in several plants in which *pay increases were geared to employee mastery*, with no limit set; people were encouraged to learn and to teach each other.[11] One key here is that the learning opportunity was associated with material opportunity as well. As I have already pointed out, a *sense of new future prospects* opening up may be as or more important than change in the tasks themselves in accounting for the value of job encroachment or job enlargement. At Cummins Engine, for example, the redesign of jobs to include higher-order tasks led, in effect, to promotions, because the increased responsibility brought a higher grade designation and pay, transforming what had been seen as a "dead-end job" with

[9]See Ronald Dore, *British Factory-Japanese Factory: The Origins of National Diversity in Industrial Relations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

[10]Robert N. Ford, *Motivation through the Work Itself* (New York: American Management Association, 1969) and "Job Enrichment Lessons from AT&T," *Harvard Business Review*, 51 (January-February 1973), pp. 96-106. See also Louis E. Davis and Eric L. Trist, "Improving the Quality of Work Life: Sociotechnical Case Studies," in *Work and the Quality of Life*, James O'Toole, ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974), pp. 246-80.

[11]Richard E. Walton, "Innovative Restructuring of Work," in *The Worker and the Job*, Jerome M. Rosow, ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974), pp. 145-76. The plants were General Foods and Norsk Fertilizer.

poor pay and no chance for advancement into a position with opportunity.[12]

There is another way to approach the problem of scarcity of opportunity in hierarchical systems. *Decentralization* of large organizations could open more leadership positions. To create more units, to break larger structures into smaller ones, would not necessarily increase the number of workers, but it could very easily increase the number of opportunities and "managerial" openings. The Hutterites, a set of over one hundred communal villages in the American and Canadian Great Plains, offer a striking example. When a colony gets to be over a certain size (much more than a hundred people), tensions increase — in part because there are only so many leadership positions in a colony, and some people's alienation grows in response to opportunity blockage, even in this society of alternative values. So at this point, the colony divides in two, perhaps along the lines of contending power blocs, with half the members going off to found a new colony.[13] Leadership opportunities are also doubled in the process. In this sense, then, decentralization reverses the bureaucratic trend toward putting more and more people under the control of fewer and fewer. It requires countering the concentration of power that is part of oligarchic development. Yet, more decentralization is possible than most organization planners usually assume. (Decentralization also enters later as an aspect of empowering.)

A final opportunity-enhancing organization design strategy is addressed to two issues especially relevant to women: (a) helping people acquire more skills and competences on the job itself; and (b) helping people meet outside family responsibilities while still receiving equal treatment inside the organization. This is an innovation originally developed in Germany but gradually spreading worldwide, in the public sector as well as the private; *flexible working hours*. Under flex-time systems, employees control the exact hours they work (out of a full-time week) within limits specified in advance — for example, everyone might be required to be present between 10 A.M. and 2 P.M.[14]

Flex-time represents more than a rearrangement of working hours, although just in this aspect alone it is helpful to women with family responsibilities. (It should come as no surprise that one piece of research found married women with children to be the most satisfied with flex-time of any group studied.) Time control can bring with it many other opportunity-enhancing modifications of the organization of work. It is difficult to maintain certain kinds of limiting hierarchical structures, such as supervisors' total control of decision making, when people have the freedom to choose when they work and how to make sure that their job is covered. A sense of belonging to a team with responsibility for an overall effort,

---

[12]E. James Bryan, "Work Improvement and Job Enrichment: The Case of Cummins Engine Company," in *The Quality of Working Life: Cases and Commentary*, L. E. Davis and A. B. Cherns, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1975), p. 318.

[13]John Hostetler, *Hutterite Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975).

[14]Results are summarized in Barry A. Stein, Allan Cohen, and Herman Gadon, "Flextime: Work When You Want To," *Psychology Today*, 10 (June 1976): pp. 40-43, 80. See also Alvar O. Elbing, Herman Gadon, and John R. Gordon, "Flexible Working Hours: It's About Time," *Harvard Business Review*, 52 (January-February 1974), pp. 18-33; Robert T. Golembiewski, Rick Hilles, and Munro S. Kagno, "A Longitudinal Study of Flexi-Time Effects: Some Consequences of an OD Structural Intervention," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 10 (October-November-December 1974), pp. 503-32; Virginia H. Martin, *Hours of Work When Workers Can Choose: The Experience of 59 Organizations with Employee-Chosen Staggered Hours and Flexitime* (Washington, D.C.: Business and Professional Women's Foundation, 1975).

rather than a feeling of being just an isolated worker with limited responsibility, is created in people, because they must be able to act as replacements for one another when someone is not at work. Members of work teams come to train one another and serve as teachers as well as fellow workers, as they do in many organizations using *autonomous work groups*.[15] All these conditions can improve the prospects for people under flex-time to gain self-esteem and a sense of personal efficacy, along with work satisfaction, motivation, and learning — all very important for women in low-mobility and low-power jobs. Employees under flex-time are, in effect, increasing their own competences and learning decision-making and "managerial" skills.

Organizational officials also need to be reeducated to provide the necessary backup for opportunity-enhancing structural interventions. The first involves *counseling* or *"people-development skills" for managers*. Many of the structural innovations suggested require the support and active participation of managers in helping low-mobility employees get assessments of competence, guidance about further education or improvement, and help in mapping out a future career plan. This means transforming the managerial role from tyrant to teacher. The organization, of course, must back up such innovations with rewards to managers for their subordinates' mobility (especially those managers who feel powerless or are understandably reluctant to lose good employees), making "human resource development" a critical part of a manager's own "performance appraisal." But, in addition, managers will need to be taught how to be effective counselors. This is particularly important in cultures where (a) a deference barrier exists between superiors and subordinates, or (b) where norms of politeness interfere with a manager's ability to offer criticisms, or (c) where men in authority positions do not know how to talk honestly to women about their jobs, or (d) where the ideas of evaluation of competence, goal setting, and future planning are not prominent. Managers could be taught how to give and receive feedback, how to evaluate the elements entering into a job, and how to collaborate with another person in setting mutually agreed-upon objectives. These skills would also be useful to managers in their own career development, especially as "management by objectives" spreads to more systems.

In general, organizations with enhanced opportunity would be, I propose, more alive and exciting places. There would be fewer people indifferent to work or considered "dead wood." There would be more enthusiasm for innovation and less dysfunctional conservative resistance. And there would be structural supports for more equal treatment of women, minorities and disadvantaged classes.

EMPOWERING STRATEGIES

The second set of issues face those in leadership roles who are expected to mobilize others and are held accountable for decisions and results. Their effectiveness is shaped by their relative power or powerlessness, which affects their desirability as leaders, the morale and satisfaction of their subordinates, and their supervisory style. Low system power has both organizational impacts — in the person's ability to gain cooperation and do

[15]These results are similar to those reported for some experiments in systematic work redesign. See Walton, "Innovative Restructuring of Work." An informant from a large insurance company utilizing flex-time very effectively told me that the biggest benefit was the change it forced in management style, away from "babysitting" or "headcounting" ("the visual school of management") to longer-range planning. On semiautonomous work teams, [see] Stephen C. Iman, "The Development of Participation by Semiautonomous Work Teams: The Case of Donnelly Mirrors," in *The Quality of Working Life: Cases and Commentary*, L.E. Davis and A.B. Cherns, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1975), pp. 216-31.

the job—and social psychological effects—in a feeling of powerlessness that often promotes rigid, controlling behaviors. Power, we saw in Chapter 7, has both a job-related and a social component. It is associated with the exercise of discretion, the chance to demonstrate out-of-the-ordinary capacities in the job, handling uncertainties rather than routine events; with access to visibility; and with the relevance of the job to current organizational problems. As is well known, organizations also have an informal power structure coexisting alongside of the formal delegation of authority, which is influenced by formal arrangements but may or may not correspond to official hierarchical distinctions. Thus, power is also accumulated through alliances with sponsors, successful peers, and up-and-coming subordinates. To empower those women and others who currently operate at a disadvantage requires attention to both sides of power. It is always hard to get at real power issues or make impactful changes in a power structure, since, almost by definition, those with power have a stake in keeping it for themselves. However, with this limitation in mind, it is still possible to try to structurally improve the power position of more people.

Just as opportunity enhancement begins with change in the formal structure of the organization (career paths and job ladders), empowerment must also start with, and rest fundamentally on, modification of official structural arrangements. *Flattening the hierarchy* — removing levels and spreading formal authority — is among the more general and important strategies. It has the virtues of adding to the power component of jobs (the non-routine, discretionary, and visible aspects) along with increasing contact among managers, at the same time that it can speed up decisions and improve communication.

Some executives I interviewed felt that flattening managerial hierarchies is a good idea, for a number of reasons worth quoting. Too many levels of managers were seen as detracting from the power of each of them. It was considered hard, with an extra layer and thus fewer people reporting directly to any one manager, to avoid "over-managing" — either supervising too closely or jumping in to do the job oneself. Typical comments included: "Our steep hierarchy prevents effective communication; everyone puts his own interpretation on vital messages. It makes me doubt the validity of some communications." "It's so hard to get a decision that I think of this as a glass, forty-story graveyard. Impediments in the decision-making process affect the morale of the whole organization. It's hard to bridge levels." "People don't take risks, because things get reviewed more critically in a deeper organization — there are more channels to pass through....So I think the best thing we can do is to have as flat an organization as possible. In a flat organization, people underneath become better managers. They are more autonomous, and they feel more powerful."

Evidence about the relative effectiveness of flat and tall organizations on overall performance measures is mixed, but one research team, reviewing in depth five studies with moderately dependable results, concluded that job satisfaction, at least, is associated with flatter organizations; job satisfaction goes up as number of levels of the hierarchy goes down.[16] Flat organizations appear to increase satisfaction, in part, through the greater power they provide — greater exercise of authority at lower levels, more control over organizational goals and strategies, and a greater feeling of mastery and esteem.[17] In one carefully researched case, a level of manage-

[16]Suresh Srivastva, et al., *Job Satisfaction and Productivity* (Cleveland: Department of Organizational Behavior, Case Western Reserve University, 1975), p. 52.

[17]H. H. Carpenter, "Formal Organizational Structural Factors and Perceived Job Satisfaction of Classroom Teachers," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16 (1971), pp. 460-65. L. W. Porter and E. E. Lawler III found, in a survey of managers, that flat

ment was eliminated and replaced by project teams and downward delegation; gains were derived in job satisfaction, commitment, and personal and group productivity (though not in overall organizational effectiveness or satisfaction with superiors). In another case, the hierarchy in a plant was flattened from seven to four levels of supervision; among other things, this helped supervisors become more participatory.[18] This association of flatter hierarchies with participation is not surprising. In general, there is an association, holding across many cultures, between an organization's degree of participation and the gradient defining the sharpness of differentiation of hierarchical levels; more participatory organizations have flatter gradients.[19]

In all of these instances, what should be noted are the effects on those holding authority and accountability, as well as the effects on workers. According to my analysis, many of the positive effects of flatter organizations would be phenomena associated with power, mediated by the empowerment of remaining managers. When lower levels have the chance to accumulate more power upward and outward, they can become more participatory downward (less controlling, less closely supervising, more supportive of the autonomy and discretion of subordinates or clients), thus increasing the "job satisfaction" of those below. If job enrichment or flex-time, for example, turn the supervisor from watchdog to long-range planner, they can serve to *empower* that supervisor — if they reduce the routine component of the job, provide more access to the chance for non-ordinary and visible acts, perhaps link the supervisor more closely to top power-holders, and so forth. Some theorists of socio-technical systems have recognized this.[20] Yet many writers seem to imply that the supervisors, in these cases, are becoming *less* powerful, because they are less controlling. Sometimes they are rendered powerless, but here is where my theory differs substantially. When such alternatives work, it is because they enhance the opportunity of those below while *simultaneously* empowering those above.

Decentralization can empower as well as enhance opportunity, if it creates more *autonomous work units*. In one study of 656 sales workers in 36 offices of a national firm, the most effective offices — those with above-average performances by salespeople, among other features — were characterized by greater power and autonomy. There were high levels of interpersonal influence inside the office and high levels of control over office operations by local managers and sales staff.[21]

Any structural change that *increases an official's discretion and latitude*

---

organizations seemed better for self-actualization, while tall met security needs, in "The Effects of 'Tall' Versus 'Flat' Organization Structures on Managerial Satisfaction," *Personnel Psychology*, 17 (1964), pp. 135-48. A laboratory experiment using 15-person organizations with either two or four levels concluded that the tall organization was superior in decision-making performance, but the simulated organizations lacked many features common to real bureaucracies, such as status and reward differences and restriction of certain information to top levels, which could make tall organizations less efficient. See Rocco Carzo, Jr., and John N. Yanouzas, "Effects of Flat and Tall Organization Structure," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14 (1969), pp. 178-91.

[18]Gene W. Dalton, Louis B. Barnes, and Abraham Zaleznik, *The Distribution of Authority in Formal Organizations* (Boston: Harvard Business School Division of Research, 1968); Walton, "Innovative Restructuring of Work."

[19]Tannenbaum, et al., *Hierarchy in Organizations*.

[20]Louis Davis and Eric Trist, important figures in the socio-technical school, argued that when supervisors are given more technical and professional responsibility, they won't supervise as closely. See "Improving the Quality of Work Life."

[21]Jerald G. Bachman, Clagett G. Smith, and Jonathon A. Slesinger, "Control, Performance, and Satisfaction: An Analysis of Structural and Individual Effects," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4 (1966), pp. 127-36.

and reduces the number of veto barriers for decisions is, in general, then, empowering. (Note that increasing latitude does not mean increasing the number of subordinates.)[22] Overly bureaucratized organizations that limit and box in a decision maker's domain tend to produce the mentality of powerlessness, and women, in particular, may be crowded into supervisory or professional slots where their exercise of authority is restricted. But wider latitude for risk and innovation can be provided, along with more opportunity to design options for the conduct of the affairs of the unit over which authority is supposedly given. In one case at Xerox, increasing responsibility, discretion, and areas for autonomous decision making among customer representatives resulted in better employee attitudes and service performance.[23] (The company calls this "job enrichment" but it would be better labelled "empowerment.") By cutting out some channels and veto barriers, the organization gave people more power and improved their effectiveness. In other instances, giving foremen, supervisors, and/or workers more discretion over budgets and more latitude for implementing their own decisions has led to technical improvements in equipment and work design associated with increased output.[24]

Adding decision-making rights and increasing professional responsibilities for the powerless can thus improve an organization's functioning in several ways. First, most organizations cannot really afford the waste of talent that is involved every time people are put into empty positions with lofty-sounding titles but no right to make changes or invent new ways to conduct a unit's affairs. Secondly, empowerment can turn a manager's attention from control over others to more organizationally relevant matters as planning and innovation, unlocking hidden capabilities. This suggests a dramatically different *role for managers* of the future: as *planners and professionals* rather than watchdogs. There will be more room for those with expertise and less room for "bosses" in the traditional sense. (Radicals are not the only ones to wonder whether old-fashioned "bosses" are really necessary.) Organization planners, then, should identify those areas where decision-making power can be distributed more widely. *Team concepts* and the carrying out of work by *task forces* and *project groups* with control over the total process encourage the sharing of power by more and more people.

While the other side of power, the informal alliance-based side, is more difficult to tackle, it is still possible to suggest organizational alternatives. Strategies can also be developed to provide *access to the power structure* for people like women, who are the most likely to be excluded. They might include *opening communication channels* and making *system knowledge* (such as budgets, salaries, or the minutes of certain meetings) more routinely available for everyone. In many large organizations, people at the lower end of management ladders often lack even basic system knowledge that seems to be hidden for no very good reason — the salary range for certain job grades, for example, or who made particular kinds of decisions. Some may not know the names or faces of senior officials or the organiza-

[22]Recent research has shown that number of subordinates is not necessarily related to closeness of supervision, a style I take as a sign of powerlessness. See Gerald D. Bell, "Determinants of Span of Control," *American Journal of Sociology*, 73 (July 1967), pp. 100-109.

[23]Carl D. Jacobs, "Job Enrichment of Field Technical Representatives — Xerox Corporation," in *The Quality of Working Life: Cases and Commentary*, L. E. Davis and A. B. Cherns, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1975), pp. 285-99.

[24]Derek W. E. Burden, "Participative Management as a Basis for Improved Quality of Jobs: The Case of Microwax Department, Shell U.K., Ltd.," in *The Quality of Working Life: Cases and Commentary*, L. E. Davis and A. B. Cherns, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1975), pp. 201-15.

tion of positions at the top. Women are perhaps more likely than men to lack system knowledge or understanding of the ins and outs of fringe benefits and perquisites because they more often lack well-connected peers or sponsors who would make informal introductions or educate them about the *real* workings of the system. So information and communication can be a first step toward empowerment. *Access to operating data* and formerly restricted information is a must, furthermore, for any decentralized or team-oriented system. Often the effectiveness of behavior in organizations is hampered by lack of valid information, in Chris Argyris' terms. And, as Philip Selznick has pointed out, *full disclosure* of corporate information may be demanded by employees as a right in the future.[25] It is also possible that "organizational civil rights" such as information access will increasingly be backed by legal guarantees.

Second, since *sponsorship* is an important vehicle for accumulating power, it is possible to conceive of ways in which it might be extended to more people. Now it occurs informally, but it could be a formal part of a management- or talent-development system. Indeed, superiors could be officially rewarded for the number of successful subordinates they produce, for developing the young people under them, particularly women or minorities who do not usually "make it." Managers would be encouraged to sponsor their subordinates for better jobs and would have a stake in seeing that they do well, even to the extent of helping them in the new position. "*Artificial sponsorship*" can also be created for women, through connections with senior people other than their immediate managers. We saw in Chapter 7 how subtle the sponsorship relationship is, but there is still some benefit to trying to create formal mentors. Such people are in a position to help ease women into the system and, hopefully, to provide a continuing link to power over time. Organizations should also routinely schedule meetings and events which give women an opportunity to come into contact with power holders.

Orientation programs for new women or people in new jobs offer an ideal time for empowering interventions. Both "foster sponsors" and the communication of system information could be a routine part of the introduction of women, for example, to new positions. Procedures that do this would help solve a lingering question: Even if women are hired, how can their success be reasonably guaranteed? The government can set down guidelines, and the organization hires the requisite number of female bodies. But what do they do then? What happens next? What sorts of training are offered, how are women introduced to the organization? Are networks created? The network issue is of special concern for women in fields where they are still numerically scarce. And how are the women to be integrated with their male peers in empowering ways?

One useful model can be derived from a management-training program I designed that prepared both women and men for a job held formerly only by men. Women as well as men were about to be supervising a largely male, blue-collar work force, and they would be the first women ever to hold such jobs. This design was intended to address all of the structural issues that often defeat women entering formerly all-male jobs. In this case,

[25]Evidence about the need for employee sharing of management information is in Walton, "Innovative Restructuring of Work"; and Paul Bernstein, "Necessary Elements for Effective Worker Participation in Decision Making," *Journal of Economic Issues*, 10 (June 1976), pp. 490-522. The issue of valid information appears throughout Chris Argyris' work: for an application to the question of individual efficacy, see "The Incompleteness of Social Psychological Theory," *American Psychologist*, 24 (October 1969), pp. 893-918. The Selznick reference is to Philip Selznick, *Law, Society, and Industrial Justice* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969).

politics was considered more important than skills; management skills would be included, of course, but some "system" power would also be provided for the trainees.

First, team feeling was created among the men and women being trained so that the women in the group would have sponsorship and support later from male peers who would be more initially acceptable to their subordinates. Joint participation in training programs is often a source of powerful *peer alliances*.[26] Higher-level supervisors were brought into the program, and the links of communication to them were opened. They got to know the women trainees better than any previous group of new managers. Other managers in the field (especially men) were involved and made to feel part of the project so that they, too, would be motivated to help introduce the women later. A cycle of field placements in between training activities was developed, so the women could get to meet a wide variety of personnel and would be, in turn, less mysterious to those who loved to gossip. They were sent out to "interview" the few senior women managers in the system, in the hope that sponsor-protégé relationships would develop there. In short, the program tried to offer *role models, potential sponsors,* and *allies*. It tried to lay the groundwork for a support system and a power base that would help the women as well as the men succeed as managers. (But note that we also did not force anyone into relationships; we merely provided opportunity and access.)

Empowering can proceed through *training for managers* as well. Managers must be routinely educated to *provide power backup* for decisions made by those under them (always short of catastrophe, of course) and to eliminate behaviors that disempower women. Managers can learn about their own behavior and see how much power they offer to subordinates. They could be encouraged to eliminate any practices creating the appearance that women or other subordinates have less than full authority to make decisions on their own. Such negative practices often include: watching women more closely than men, thinking of women managers or professionals as an "experiment" that must be monitored, or reviewing the decisions of women more frequently than usual. "Protective" actions that prevent women from solving their own problems should also be discouraged. It makes a woman look weak and powerless to have a man take over for her in emergencies or crises. The message that gets communicated is: "She's only capable of handling routine matters. She cannot be counted on when the crunch comes." Other forms of power-defeating protection include oversolicitous treatment, giving women the easiest assignments, and making fewer demands on women than on men, letting them slide by without ever having to prove themselves on the firing line.

Education for managers on traditional male behaviors toward women would help ensure that women are given challenges and full opportunity to handle crises on their own. Men in the system could learn to check any tendency to rush in and save a woman; if they slow down, she can save herself — and contribute to a more powerful image in the process. Managers have a role to play in empowering women. They should let others know that women managers or professionals under them have the power of the system behind them, and that they will not keep on peering over the

[26]One top manager from General Electric, reflecting on his early days as a trainee, recalled the camaraderie of his training group and the lasting friendships made. It also turned out (not surprisingly) that that "fine bunch of people" all became high executives, and the esprit de corps was translated into advantageous peer alliances. See George W. Downing's report of his experiences in "The Changing Structure of a Great Corporation," in W. Lloyd Warner and Darab B. Unwalla, eds., *The Emergent American Society: Large-Scale Organizations* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 158-240.

136

woman's shoulder to make sure everything is all right. They should routinely refuse to listen to people who try to come directly to them, circumventing the woman. They should communicate, "She is in charge of her area," with every gesture. Since so much of managment revolves around trust, around delegation of authority to people with the legitimate right to make decisions that commit parts of the system, organizations need to find official ways to let members and client populations know that women, too, are trusted, and that women, too, can be powerful. Particularly in cultures where paternalism and attitudes of chivalry prevail, there is a need for men to learn how their behavior affects the prospects for women's work effectiveness.

Organizations which empower larger numbers of people would be more effective on a number of dimensions. They would reduce the dysfunctional consequences of powerlessness: low morale, bureaucratic rules-mindedness, and tight territorial control. They would benefit from speedy decisions and ability to take advantage of innovations. And they would develop better leaders, even among members of groups who have not traditionally become organizational leaders.

NUMBER-BALANCING STRATEGIES

The third structural constraint requiring change is particularly relevant to affirmative action. It stems from the numerical proportion of people of minorities or women in the organization. In any job category or peer level where men vastly outnumber women, for example, so that women are virtually alone among all-male peers, the problems of "tokenism" arise, and those women operate at a disadvantage in the organization. Tokenism is not unique to women, of course. It is a situation that handicaps members of any racial or ethnic minority who find themselves working nearly alone among members of another social category.

Tokenism is not a problem for the majority of women in organizations, because by definition they tend to be concentrated in typically "female" jobs, where they are likely to constitute the bulk of employees. But it becomes an increasing problem for those women who occupy jobs most frequently held by men, generally closer to the top of the organization. And it is a problem that must be overcome in efforts to reduce occupational segregation, for the first women to enter a formerly "male" field are likely to encounter the dynamics of tokenism. It is here that the informal factors and subtle behaviors identified as "sex discrimination" come into play, for they are elicited by a situation of unequal numbers. The constraints to equal participation brought about by tokenism can occur even if it was *not* the organization's intent to put a woman into an "empty" job for display purposes (the conventional meaning of tokenism).

Some policy implications are obvious in this area. Tokenism is to be avoided, if at all possible. *Batch* rather than one-by-one *hiring* of women for top positions should be the rule. More than one or two women at a time should be placed in every unit where women are scarce. Secondly, when a number of women are brought into positions where they are numerically rare, *clustering* rather than spreading is useful. Women should be clustered in groups in sufficient numbers to be no longer identifiable as tokens, even if it means that some groups or departments or units or locales have none at all. Many organizations currently disperse the available women and spread them over every possible group, as though they were a scarce resource of which each office or group should have at least one. However, this policy may be counterproductive for the organization as well as potentially damaging to the person who is thus forced into the position of token.

Role models are especially important for women in token positions, who

are likely to feel alone. They have little idea of what forms of behavior are most appropriate, since their only sources of information are the men with whom they work, and, as discussed earlier, sometimes majority-group members would rather see tokens as stereotypes than equally competent peers. It can be very useful for tokens to learn about the strategies and coping mechanisms of successful women. Organizations can schedule meetings and public lectures, or they can make information about successful women in the system available through employee newsletters.

The development of a *women's network* should also be considered. Women can offer each other feedback and support that it is difficult for those in token positions to get from immediate colleagues. These networks are more effective when they are task related and have a meaningful function to perform for the organization, instead of more peripheral social clubs (which reinforce stereotypes about women's greater interest in talk than tasks). One useful format is a series of women's task forces to aid in the recruitment and orientation of other women. The network then grows automatically, and women are also empowered and collaborating in the process.

Less obvious is the need for more *flexible organization structures*. Clustering is not always possible; sometimes women (or other potential tokens) are not found in the organization in sufficient numbers with the right jobs or skills to permit groupings of substantial size; furthermore, members of other groups, including the majority category itself, might be disadvantaged by some forms of clustering. However, if the organization is sufficiently flexible that in the course of their jobs people belong to more than one group, have contact with more than one leader, move from place to place or unit to unit, then they also have the opportunity to come together with enough others of their own category for task-related purposes so that they can begin to transcend the effects of tokenism, gain personal support, and demonstrate to the others the inaccuracy of stereotypes. With a flexible organization structure permitting such continual grouping and regrouping (as in *project management* or *job rotation*), the culture of any one group becomes more permeable to the effects of the presence of minority people, and it becomes more difficult for a group to maintain an insulated, and thus excluding, culture. So flexible structures that enhance opportunity help balance numbers.

Until there are enough women or minorities in place, *leaders* themselves need to be *educated about tokenism*. While waiting for structures to readjust to the numerical transformations, organization leaders can help ease the transition away from tokenism and help present tokens cope with their situation. Training for managers, supervisors, and other administrators or leaders ought to consider the dynamics of tokenism along with other kinds of group dynamics. They can then come to see that many of the problems faced by tokens stem from the *structure of the situation* rather than the personal characteristics of the tokens as individuals (or category members). If leaders become aware of their own stereotypes, they can help to model a different kind of behavior to other employees. They can also begin to see the longer time involved for tokens to demonstrate their competence or establish good working relationships because of the additional things tokens must overcome; with this insight, perhaps leaders could treat tokens with enough patience to allow their competence to surface.

Support programs for women can also be useful. Such programs offer an alternative to clustering or network development. They would encourage women to help each other gain insight into any problems of their current job situation, thus fostering a collaborative attitude among women who

might otherwise be tempted to side with men and turn against women. These programs should also discuss the dynamics of tokenism and work toward sharing solutions to the problems of unequal numbers. They could also be a component in other training programs.

But number balancing should be the ultimate goal. Organizations with a better balance of people would be more tolerant of the differences among them. In addition to making affirmative action a reality, there would be other benefits: a reduction in stress on the people who are "different," a reduction in conformity pressures on the dominant group. It would be more possible, in such an organization, to build the skill and utilize the competence of people who currently operate at a disadvantage, and thus to vastly enhance the value of an organization's prime resource: its people.

THE LIMITS OF REFORM?

All of these concrete strategies represent modifications of work organizations as most of them are presently constituted. Such changes could help solve the "affirmative action" problems faced by employers. They could make life easier for present incumbents of organizational positions, and they could give more people, women and men alike, a fair chance to experience a greater sense of opportunity, power, and acceptance in their jobs. But as valuable as strategies of reform may be in theory, they are limited in practice by serious barriers to change, as well as problems of intervention and implementation. The very process of introducing a new program itself requires careful attention. Change efforts can fail for a number of reasons that have little to do with the ultimate value of the new policy: insufficient support from the top or the bottom, inadequate prior diagnosis of the actual state of the system where the change is launched, insufficient attention to the effects of a program beyond the local area where it is introduced. And there is the problem of time for a change to prove itself or take hold. Sometimes this time is not allowed because crises occur, such as economic downturns; when threatened, the organization may fall back on accepted procedures and hierarchical control. Progressive as well as reactionary organizations succumb in times of crisis.[27]

It is also unfortunately common that innovations are introduced on an experimental basis in large systems, and then, even if they prove worthwhile, they never move beyond their first base. The organization attempts to create an insulated, protected territory as a testing ground, and then the innovation is never diffused further. Inter-unit rivalries play a role here; sometimes one division refuses to touch any rearrangement originating in another department. This is a dilemma of the large system: bigness means that innovations must often start small and locally, but then the complex system dynamics associated with bigness can make it difficult for anything small and local to be accepted on a larger scale. Furthermore, there are equity problems when one group in an organization is given benefits — even on an experimental basis — that are not available to others. This gives the organization the costly, and often impossible, choice of starting big (doing it everywhere at once) or not doing it at all.

In addition, as many commentators have noted, no one specific structural innovation by itself (job redesign or job rotation or flexible work hours alone) is likely, over time, to significantly improve work-life quality or equity for disadvantaged groups. Indeed, there may even be problems, as I

[27]Even progressive companies may become conservative in times of financial pressure. See William O. Lytle, Jr., " 'A Smart Camel May Refuse that Last Straw': A Case Study of Obstacles to Job and Organization Design in a New Manufacturing Operation," in *The Quality of Working Life: Cases and Commentary*, L. E. Davis and A. B. Cherns, eds. (New York: Free Press, 1975), pp. 110-37. The case is about Polaroid, well known for its advanced and humanistic personnel policies.

indicated in Chapter 9, if a program is introduced without other, supporting, organizational changes. More comprehensive approaches are thus needed, using an integrated combination of methods (e.g., job redesign along with a changed pay structure, career opportunities, a new view of the manager's role and flexible work hours). Yet this conclusion, reached by Harvard Business School researchers as well as radical critics of human relations programs, implies wide-spread system change — virtually the construction of an entirely new system. Such comprehensive change has inherent difficulties and complexities, as well as posing the greatest threat to the greatest number of entrenched power groups and those who like the security of what currently exists. Raymond Katzell and Daniel Yankelovich asked a sample of managers and labor leaders how they felt about programs to improve the quality of work life. There were negative reactions on both sides. One manager said, "Why should I preside over an activity that may well succeed in undermining management's prerogatives?" And a union official said, "Why should I cooperate when the results may undermine the authority of this union just to play management's game?"[28]

For all of these reasons, the possibilities for reform in large organizations may be inevitably limited. And many bureaucratic binds would remain. The problems created by large size and its seemingly inevitable companion, steep hierarchy, would be left to plague people in organizations. Inequities of opportunity and rewards would not disappear, and the power of large organizations over economic life in general would continue.

Thus, organizational reform is not enough. It is also important to move beyond the issues of whether or not concrete individuals get their share to questions of how shares are determined in the first place — how labor is divided and how power is concentrated. The solutions to such questions are clearly beyond the scope of this book, but they form the backdrop that places an ultimate limit on how much can be accomplished by changing organizational structure alone. There are growing numbers of scholars and writers, from all branches of the social sciences as well as business life itself, who have come to the conclusion that large organizations cannot be made effective any more than they can be fully humanized; such systems appear to be economically efficient only because of their power over markets and other aspects of the environment.[29]

A variety of criticisms has been leveled against very large organizations: that communication becomes so sluggish it is not possible to deal effectively with inputs from the environment; that they are wasteful of resources, especially in increased coordination and administrative costs; that they have so much power that their actions can create vast imbalances for society; and that a pervasive sense of powerlessness is generated in most members. The larger the organization, the greater the need for coordination and the more limited the possibilities for local decision making and independent action — necessary for empowerment — as Barry Stein has pointed out.[30] Furthermore, as long as the steep multi-leveled hierarchies that tend to accompany large size remain, it is impossible to remedy many inequities of compensation or opportunity, let alone em-

[28]Raymond A. Katzell and Daniel Yankelovich, *Work, Productivity, and Job Satisfaction: An Evaluation of Policy-Related Research* (New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1975).

[29]A vast amount of economic and sociological literature on the effects of organizational size is summarized in Barry A. Stein, *Size, Efficiency, and Community Enterprise* (Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Community Economic Development, 1974). See also E. F. Schumacher, *Small Is Beautiful* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1973); Bernard P. Indik, "Some Effects of Organization Size on Member Attitudes and Behavior," *Human Relations*, 16 (November 1963), pp. 369-84.

[30]Stein, *Size, Efficiency, and Community Enterprise*.

power more people or share decision making more widely. When the model is hierarchical rather than collegial, there would also appear to be real limits on the extent to which it is possible to expand anyone's power, other than for those people who already have the managerial monopoly. With unemployment an issue and economic growth in question, there may be real limits on the opportunity to move ahead, let alone hold a desirable job at all. And finally, it is difficult to conceive of opportunity-enhancing reforms in large organizations that do not constitute further bureaucratization (and along with it, powerlessness): an increase in procedures and systems, a growth of paperwork. (These complaints already exist around affirmative action programs in many organizations.) But also, something human is lost when personal discretion — limiting though it may be in some senses for those subject to it — is replaced by bureaucratic rationalization.

These issues about the realistic problems of change must be addressed, but they do not render reform any less necessary. We must go ahead, even with imperfect knowledge, and even in the full awareness that further dilemmas will follow action.

Although I believe that the best solutions ultimately lie in the development of viable alternatives to large, overly hierarchical organizations, I also think that considerable improvement is possible in the organizations we have now. Organizational reform can immediately affect the prospects for millions of workers and fundamentally change their relationship to their work, while at the same time models of smaller, more egalitarian, and more manageable organizations can be put forth and tested. A good revolutionary would not agree, for reform is seen as counter to the goals of fundamental social change, especially if fundamental social change is required to reduce the dominance of giant organizations, break up managerial monopolies on decision making, and redistribute material rewards. So the revolutionary would argue against strategies that temporarily alleviate distress, emphasizing the positive value of present suffering in heightening radical consciousness.

But who bears the burden of the waiting? Not the well-off. No, it is the people without advantage who continue to lose out: the women who find doors closed to them in certain jobs; the people stuck in dead-end positions, whose lack of opportunity depresses their aspirations and sense of self; the powerless who bear the frustrations of trying to manage without any real resources or influence; the token women or token minorities who suffer from their isolation.

The costs to organizations in productivity and effectiveness of routinely producing such people are considerable, in the sheer waste of potential human talent. Even more serious — and harder to measure — are the costs to those people as individuals. Work, which should be energizing and enlivening, which can be a vehicle for discovering and testing the limits of one's capabilities, for contributing and being recognized, becomes instead a source of strain or dependency or limitation.

It is the people caught in such situations — and the people who cannot even find a job — women and men alike, that make me unwilling to wait.

Premises for Promoting Equity in Higher Education

Carol Wolfe Konek

The development of strategies for creating a climate supportive of institutional and individual change may be based on the following premises:

1. *The attainment of educational equity increases the synergy of the institution.* That is, the attainment of educational equity demonstrates that the good of the individual, the good of the university, and the good of society are synonymous, rather than antagonistic.[1] Increasing leadership opportunities for women within the university will increase the ability of the university to function as a model for equity in a society based on democratic values and on the belief in the worth of the individual.

2. *The university can increase its vitality by adjusting to changing social realities.*[2] The university is an open, rather than a closed system: its dynamic equilibrium depends upon its ability to continuously adapt to changes within and outside itself. Higher education has been slow to adapt to the changing aspirations and abilities of women; such an adaptation requires the inclusion of women in all areas of the system in order that the university keep pace with internal and external forces for equity. The leadership challenge inherent in attaining educational equity is to mesh what the outside world wants, needs, and expects from the institution in terms of goals, priorities, and related programs with what the internal constituencies want, need, and expect, while realizing that an institution which is alien to its environment cannot survive.[3]

3. *The history of higher education in the United States has demonstrated an egalitarian trend congruent with the concept of educational equity.* The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education reported that the three periods of basic transformation of access to higher education included the movement from elite access to mass access to universal access.[4] This trend has had the effect of removing obstacles based on race, sex, age, and economic status and can be viewed as the social milieu within which leaders in higher education must work to see that equity in access to education is balanced with equity in access to the effects of education. Such a philosophy clearly implies that individuals for whom race, sex, age, and economic status might have been disadvantages to mobility in the past must be given affirmative assistance in obtaining the benefits of education in the future.

4. *Heterogeneous leadership is appropriate to institutions with diverse student populations.* As the leadership in higher education is transformed by an inclusion rather than an exclusion principle, entry of diverse students into higher education should increase, along with the level of academic achievement and degree attainment. Legislative gains in reducing disadvantages based on race, sex, age, and economic status can be viewed as a reflection of the social imperative for equity in leadership and for the expansion of role definitions of leadership.

---

[1]Maslow, Abraham H.: *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1968), p. 221.

[2]Laszlo, Ervin: *The Systems View of the World: The Natural Philosophy of the New Developments* (New York: G. Braziller, 1972), p. 61.

[3]Richman, Barry M. & Farmer, Richard N.: *Leadership, Goals and Power in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1974), p. 2.

[4]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: *Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 3.

5. *The presence of women as role models is directly proportional to the development of young women of talent into career-successful adults.* The simultaneous decline of women in faculty positions in all undergraduate educational institutions and the increase in the enrollment of women students during the last 40 years represents a kind of disequilibrium which has serious implications for the mission of higher education.[5] This imbalance represents innumerable opportunities for positive leadership and for the creation of affirmative policies and programs for re-establishing equilibrium.

6. *Three dominant sources of change in education are:* a) *resources available for it,* b) *advocates interested in it,* c) *openness of the system to it.*[6] Resources for the support of educational equity are evidenced by increased enrollments of women students of traditional college age and of re-entry women.[7] Federal funding of Women's Educational Equity Act projects, Title IX projects, and Career Education and Community Education programs affecting the educational attainment of women demonstrate the availability of resources, in both external funding and increased tuition revenues. The fact that women and men work for recruitment, counseling and advising, curriculum revision, and program development to increase equity demonstrates the availability of personnel resources to implement change. Openness of the system to change is demonstrated by legislation, political involvement, and by the increasing awareness of equity issues in political, economic, and educational spheres. In many institutions, however, the informal system has been more open to change than has the formal system. Special programs for women have often been begun by these informal systems and have then been formalized when they demonstrated that they met legitimate needs. (The development of women's studies programs demonstrates this principle of change.)

7. *Institutions, as well as individuals, sometimes profess one set of values while demonstrating another.* The institution which formulates policies of equal access to educational offerings may be founded upon the principles of the democratic ideal and yet continue staffing patterns in which minorities and women obviously occupy the lowest ranks and leadership positions. Similarly, individuals within these institutions may express egalitarian values while enacting reward and recognition policies which perpetuate injustices structured into the system in the past. Such incongruence or cognitive dissonance creates conflicts which must be resolved to insure positive change toward growth.

8. *Conflict and institutional or personal change are associated.* Sex-role values are among those learned earliest and are most closely associated with identity formation. The intensity of conflict associated with the changing roles and status of women and men is one indication of the degree of insecurity in an individual and the degree of inflexibility in an institution. Conflict represents a learning need which calls for the development of supportive leadership techniques; but the energy generated by conflict can be transformed into affirmative action when growth in the individual and change in the institution are regarded as natural and desirable as well as inevitable.

9. *Every professional administrator is a change agent.* While some administrators function as managers rather than as leaders, every person in a

[5]Tidball, M. Elizabeth: "Perspective on Academic Women and Affirmative Action," *Educational Record*, Spring, 1973, pp. 130-35.

[6]Hefferlin, J. B. Lon: *Dynamics of Academic Reform* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pub., 1971), p. 49.

[7]Magarrell, Jack: "Women Account for 93 Percent of Enrollment Gain," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 9, 1978, Vol. XV, Number 17.

recognized leadership role can more adequately function in that role if enabled to define, support, create, and administer programs and policies which are new and which produce institutional and individual benefits. The ability to assess success in effecting change and the ability to articulate strategies employed and benefits realized by others are both essential to encouraging equity changes.

10. *Leadership can be regarded as service.*[8] Outmoded concepts of leadership often focus on the status, recognition, and responsibilities of the leader. Such concepts are likely to overemphasize the qualities of wisdom, control, and the recognition accruing to a leader with "legitimate" or "sanctioned" power. However, the facilitative leader is more often one with "enabling" or supportive power, one who does not insist upon personal recognition for his or her contributions to the greater good for the greater number.

11. *The implementation of policies which will benefit women and minorities must originate in various areas of the institution, rather than always coming from an assigned advocate or a special interest group.* Just as institutions have a limited capacity for the implementation of simultaneous changes, individuals have a limited capacity for crediting one individual or one group with the leadership necessary to effect change. Holding on to ownership of ideas for positive change retards institutional growth and the professional who helps an institution become more just in its policies benefits indirectly and sometimes directly.

12. *Change agents need to assess the impetus for change outside the institution and work to resolve individual and institutional resistance to that impetus.* This must be done in such a way as to increase the congruence of individual needs and institutional goals, a process which is integral to the attainment of educational equity and to the attainment of equitable leadership opportunities for women in higher education. It is obvious, furthermore, that the inclusion of women in new models of participatory leadership is a sound application of humanistic and organizational theory to current social needs and imperatives.

---

[8]Hammond, Geraldine: *Leadership Issues Seminar*, Project DELTA, March 9, 1977.

Project DELTA — A Model for Change

Sally L. Kitch

Project DELTA, the Women's Educational Equity Act grant program, in effect at Wichita State University from 1976-1978, has had as its goal the promotion of equity for women in higher education, specifically in leadership and in decision-making roles. Since access to and participation in leadership roles for women implies change in both personal and institutional awareness, Project DELTA has focused its research and programs on aspects of behavioral changes for women: life and career planning, self-assessment of leadership qualities and leadership skills, as well as on institutional policies and goals. Although a final assessment of changes resulting from Project DELTA's efforts will not be evident until much later, we can at this stage describe DELTA as a model for fostering change as we see it.

The programs and strategies which we developed in Project DELTA have implemented some of the principles which many others who have written on change-agent strategies have articulated. We began with the realization that we would need to build on existing support for our goals, to collaborate with existing programs which were striving for educational equity for women, and to encourage changes in the system which were already underway, such as those the university had begun to implement in order to meet declining or static enrollments and resources.

DELTA ACTIVITIES AND GOALS

The initial DELTA activity in the first year was to call a meeting of women faculty and non-teaching professionals (many of whom are in civil service staff positions) to discuss educational equity. Except for social functions (and there were very few of those), this group had never met together before. Women from diverse fields across the campus remarked on their pleasure at discovering one another and their surprise that women existed in certain fields at all. Since faculty hiring never takes place in clusters, and professional women are, perforce, initially separated from each other, we realized that clustering would have to occur through the efforts of the women themselves. We therefore designed workshops at which women could gather and discuss their interests. Groups for support of various activities, such as grant writing, research and professional writing, were suggested and undertaken. Project DELTA gave a reason as well as an opportunity for women from various fields to get to know one another, in addition to providing a forum for the discussion of the topic of women in higher education administration and leadership.

In addition to the group activities which emerged, instances of individual support networks also resulted from DELTA contacts. One woman attended a national seminar in her field which she would not even have applied for without the encouragement of her female colleagues. Several reported making career choices based on what they had learned from their colleagues, and, in a few instances, cases of overt discrimination were uncovered and discussed.

As in most universities, the existence of female role models in leadership positions at Wichita State University is minimal. But DELTA activities gave opportunities for women to meet across area, age, and experience lines. By providing a series of tasks and a reason for meeting, the Project enabled the networking process to begin.

Another method of alleviating isolation is by increasing contact among

levels of administration. One of DELTA's activities along these lines was to hold a workshop for key administrators, at which administrators were asked to discuss with one another, and others, collaborative techniques for achieving educational equity at Wichita State University, in place of vying for limited resources or competing for independently established goals. Chairpersons and directors of programs, Kellogg interns (see below), chairpersons of key university committees, highly respected non-administrative faculty, as well as college-and university-level administrators, were present at the workshop, and communication in small groups necessarily crossed traditional lines within the hierarchy.

A second activity which contributed toward opening channels of communication within the informal system was DELTA's liaison with the Kellogg Project in setting up an administrative internship program. Wichita State University was the recipient of a Leadership and Management Development Grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, a grant designed to help Wichita State University develop a model which could be used by comparable institutions in "coping with educational management problems under steady-state or declining conditions."[1] An administrative internship program was designed to be one of four subprograms of Phase II of the Kellogg project. The purpose of the internship program was the "development of leadership and administrative abilities" to "enhance active participation and contributions by many more people to the processes of change within W.S.U."[2]

At least partly because of the support activities of DELTA, and because DELTA actively encouraged women to apply for the internships, many qualified women did apply. Four were awarded the year-long, part-time internships; the fifth person was a black male. The four women interns have spent the 1977-78 academic year serving with administrators at the college and university levels, including the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and the President of the University. They have, of course, come to understand the problems of the university and its administrators from a new perspective; lines of communication have been opened; access to information has improved for the interns; and people who could not ordinarily have moved among the ranks of higher administration have been present in the offices and at meetings where decisions and policies are made. But an additional, unplanned result has also occurred: because the interns were women and a minority male, new perspectives and sets of experiences have been brought to administrators themselves by persons who were primarily apprentices.

Another important step in enlarging the role of women in leadership positions is increasing the number of women employed. The more variety of faces and personalities in the system, the more acceptable differences will become. Familiarity, in this instance, breeds tolerance and support. Project DELTA has worked from the beginning with the Affirmative Action Program to increase awareness of patterns of hiring and promotion. The university Affirmative Action Officer has been on the DELTA Advisory Committee for the two-year project. One of our concerns has been adherence of the university to the spirit as well as to the letter of affirmative action policies in order to increase numbers at all ranks and levels within the system.

In addition, helping individual women to consider their own career options with the possibility of preparing for administrative positions has

[1]"The W.K. Kellogg Foundation Leadership and Management Development Project at Wichita State University," p. 1.

[2]Ibid., p. 6.

been a priority of the Project. Enabling a woman to see herself as competent in administrative skills and helping her develop strategies for dealing with the obstacles her socialization and lifestyle may have presented are desired results of the on-campus programs for women. Without the kind of support and encouragement offered by DELTA activities, even rigorously applied affirmative action programs do not often result in an increase in the numbers of women in administration.

Finally, as others have pointed out, there are several techniques in use in organizations, and to a lesser extent in higher education, which could be developed in order to increase flexibility of jobs and, therefore, the participation of women. One is flex-time, in which employees select their own hours within prescribed limits dictated by the needs of the organization. Another is part-time professional work, in which people commit as much of their time as they wish to or can afford and are still seen as serious professionals. A third is job sharing.

As part of the liaison with the Kellogg Internship Committee, as well as during women's programs, DELTA staff members have discussed the possibility of rotating administrative positions as a way of increasing access and reducing stress, territoriality, and empire building. There are good arguments for and against such rotation, but basically the position an individual will take on this issue can be predicted by his or her positions in the hierarchy. Those who seek access tend to favor the notion of rotation and those already established to oppose it.

Analyzing the patterns of women's careers has revealed that the model of intense early education which prepares one for one's life work by age 25 is not applicable to all women. A more typical pattern may include interruptions of education and job tracks, re-assessment in middle life, re-education, and re-definition of career goals. An important observation to be made is that the female pattern may actually offer some advantages which the male pattern of early decision-making and a binding commitment to a career path does not. For one thing, recent research suggests that adulthood for both men and women is not a stable condition beginning at 21 and ending at death. Therefore change, reassessment, and later decisions may prove more wise and beneficial than early single-tracked commitments. Various patterns of education, of work and leisure, of self-development activities might actually make more sense than the out-of-college-into-a-lifetime-job traditional one.

DELTA OUTCOMES

There cannot be universally accepted outcomes of a project of DELTA's magnitude, but aspects of the Project have addressed a variety of possibilities for change. Through DELTA activities, women with aspirations to enter the system of the university as it is, and to prove that their abilities match or exceed the standards, have been encouraged to develop their credentials, complete their degrees, seek positions of leadership, and compete for existing jobs. Women who seek the modification of the system in order to expand definitions of leadership and to increase leadership opportunities within the university have been encouraged to seek alternatives by modifying their own career paths and by facilitating policies within the institution which will increase flexibility of opportunities. Men who have identified, through the course of DELTA activities, modifications they would like to make in the lock-step career pattern traditional for them have also been encouraged to seek and to support others who seek alternatives. Men who hold positions of leadership and who wish to maintain existing standards have been encouraged to see women as potential leaders and to expand the pool of candidates for positions which become available.

In addition to the research and programming components of DELTA, there was also a testing component for the development and validation of self-assessment instruments designed to eliminate sex-role bias in images and language, and to arrive at zero gender correlation in items and scales. Four instruments, focusing on leadership style, decision-making strategies, sex-role values, and personal professional satisfaction were pilot-tested and validated on regional and national samples of male and female administrators and faculty.

DELTA has also attempted to provide information about the way the institution operates which will enable people to make choices and to determine their own priorities within the constraints of the system. Discussions of the system itself have opened channels of communication and contributed to a de-mystification of the processes involved. Furthermore, women have been encouraged to participate in university governance in order to help effect and modify policies relating to their own careers.

Programs which have included men along with women have provided opportunities for men and women to discuss openly the nature of male/female professional relationships and to air apprehensions and reservations which too frequently go unspoken and unrecognized. Through this process, recognition of shared human strengths and weaknesses has occasionally taken place and a partnership among male and female colleagues has been furthered.

Perhaps the most tangible and encouraging result, after all, has been the increase in activity among the women on campus in areas of scholarship and effective participation in the university. In addition, some women have begun collaborative efforts in course design and research which will contribute to the university as well as to their own professional development. Basic to all of this is an awareness of the existence of a mutual support system and a resource pool which we are only now beginning to recognize and use fully. In fact, we have the beginning of a valuable network here and through such agents as similar networks in other places, the regional workshop, etc., we hope to see the extension of that network, with all that it can mean to us as individuals and in our collective professional lives.

DELTA Workshop Designs

Carol Wolfe Konek and Sally L. Kitch

Abstracts of DELTA workshop designs are presented without detailed instructions and without suggestions for structuring time and group formations on the assumption that most higher education professionals engaged in professional and organizational development possess human relations and workshop presentation skills, and have access to colleagues whose assistance will enable them to explore these subjects and to develop formats appropriate to the goals and audience of their own institutions.

The following personal, interpersonal, professional, and organizational development exercises are adaptable to many group techniques, such as brainstorming, role playing, fish-bowl discussions, small-group task assignment, and group simulations. They are equally adaptable to committee reporting, panel discussions, and more formal seminars with presentations by academic experts. In all DELTA activities, the values of the participants were considered in designing both the form and the content of programs and activities. Participants were allowed to raise their own questions, to define the issues as they saw them, and to formulate strategies congruent with their own values and leadership styles. The professional commitment, intellectual vitality, and ethical consciousness of W.S.U. professionals were used in defining basic issues underlying past injustice and in formulating equitable future strategies and policies.

PERSONAL, INTERPERSONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Abstract The formation of a support network for professional women within the institution was initiated with the identification of women who had already demonstrated commitment to the advancement of colleagues and to the support of policies and programs improving the status of women. The expansion of the support network, the inclusion of more women within it, and the examination of ways in which it could more effectively support the professional development of women were initial goals. In early DELTA activities, the women were encouraged: 1) to see each other as resources; 2) to counsel one another on issues such as career development, promotion, tenure, and preparation for leadership; 3) to enrich interpersonal relationships in the course of collaboration; and 4) to identify common and unique concerns. The needs assessment provided the basis for additional programming by identifying the specific issues which women within the network saw as relevant to their own leadership and professional development.

Jongeward, Dorothy and Scott, Dr[illegible]: Affirmative Action for Women: A Practical Guide (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.), 1974.

S[illegible]ssment Inventory (SAI): Unpublished instrument for the measurement of personal, interpersonal, familial, and professional role satisfaction (© 1977, Project DELTA, Wichita State University).

POSITIVE PROFESSIONAL ASSERTIVENESS

Abstract Assertive behavior is direct, honest, and effective in communicating values which increase the self-esteem of both participants in an interaction. Professional women often find that their own professional advancement, the advancement of their colleagues, and the attainment of equity goals for their institution rest on their development of affirmative communication

styles. The development of assertive techniques can teach supportive attitudes toward the self and others. Participants in DELTA activities trained themselves in: 1) articulating their own accomplishments; 2) articulating their appreciation for the accomplishments of another colleague; and 3) articulating recognition of the professional accomplishments of one colleague to another. Specific applications of these activities include volunteering for additional leadership responsibilities, recommending, nominating, and voting for one another, and creating recognition awards and rituals.

Alberti, Robert E. and Emmons, Michael L.: Your Perfect Right *(San Luis Obispo, Cal.: Impact Publishers), 1974.*

Bloom, Lynn Z., Coburn, Kanren, and Pearlman, Joan: The New Assertive Woman *(New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc.), 1975.*

Butler, Pamela: Self-Assertion for Women: A Guide to Becoming Androgynous *(New York: Canfield Press), 1976.*

Fensterheim, Herbert and Baer, Jean: Don't Say Yes When You Want to Say No *(New York: David McKay Co.), 1975.*

Phelps, Stanlee and Austin, Nancy: The Assertive Woman *(San Luis Obispo, Cal.: impact Publishers), 1975.*

PERSONAL, INTERPERSONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL ROLE BALANCE

Abstract Women are often aware of the need to exert more control and creativity in attaining balance in their personal, interpersonal, and professional roles. Activities which help them examine their own values in relation to their roles and their structuring of time and commitment of energy can be useful in clarifying priorities and in setting goals for modifying behavior. DELTA activities helped participants to: 1) share their experience of role conflict and their capabilities for developing role flexibility; 2) identify common concerns; 3) share approaches to life planning and professional development; and 4) identify personal issues which might lend themselves to group or institutional solutions. These activities provided a structure within which women could compare their perception of role expectations and life-structuring possibilities with those of their colleagues.

Bem, Sandra L.: "Probing the Promise of Androgyny," pp. 47-62 in Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes, *Kaplan, Alexandra G. and Bean, Joan P., eds. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company), 1976.*

Manis, Laura G.: Womanpower *(Cranston, R.I.: The Carroll Press Publishers), 1977.*

Rogers, Carl R.: On Becoming a Person *(Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company), 1961.*

Sargent, Alice G., ed.: Beyond Sex Roles *(St. Paul: West Publishing Company), 1977.*

POWER ASSESSMENT

Abstract Women are developing greater sophistication in understanding the nature of power, in acknowledging their own power, and in recognizing values issues related to the use of power in their personal and organizational lives. The self-assessment of beliefs and experiences which contribute to the recognition and use of power can be useful in increasing assertiveness, in defining appropriate leadership style, and in recognizing facilitative leadership and membership behaviors and strategies. DELTA activities were aimed at helping women: 1) assess and expand their roles in situations in which the power exchange is undefined; 2) understand and use position power, expert power, referent power, and enabling power; 3) identify personal and professional situations in which they experience power and powerlessness, and in which they see others empowered by

extrinsic circumstances and intrinsic factors; 4) set goals for increasing their sense of self-control and for facilitating others' responsible use of power; and 5) identify the professional development experiences which can increase their individual and collective power to influence and change the system.

Harrigan, Betty Lehan: Games Mother Never Taught You *(New York: Rawson Associates Publishers, Inc.), 1977.*

Howe, Florence: Women and the Power to Change *(New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1975.*

James, Muriel and Jongeward, Dorothy: Born to Win *(Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.), 1971.*

Jongeward, Dorothy and Scott, Dru: Women as Winners *(Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.), 1976.*

May, Rollo: Power and Innocence *(New York: Dell Publishing Co.), 1972.*

Rogers, Carl R.: On Personal Power *(New York: Delacorte Press), 1977.*

Swingle, Paul G.: The Management of Power *(Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers), 1976.*

Trahey, Jane: On Women and Power *(New York: Rawson Associates Publisher, Inc.), 1977.*

COMMUNICATION ROLES/LEADERSHIP ROLES

Abstract Professional women can become more effective communicators and can develop techniques for facilitative and participatory leadership by practicing a variety of blocking and communication behaviors and by processing the task-completion and group-maintenance effects of these behaviors. DELTA activities included: 1) simulation situations which required the arbitrary curtailing or expansion of verbal and non-verbal communication and facilitating and blocking behaviors, and 2) interactions which simulated differences and similarities between male and female communication behaviors and interaction patterns in the same-sex and mixed-sex groups. Such group experiences enabled participants to experiment with new communication behaviors and to receive feedback.

Henley, Nancy and Thorne, Barrie: "Womanspeak and Manspeak: Sex Differences and Sexism in Communiction, Verbal and Nonverbal," pp. 201-18 in Beyond Sex Roles, *Sargent, Alice G. (St. Paul: West Publishing Company), 1977.*

Hennig, Margaret and Jardim, Anne: The Managerial Woman *(Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday), 1977.*

Lassey, William R.: "Dimensions of Leadership," pp. 10-15 in Leadership and Social Change, *Lassey, William R. and Fernandez, R., eds. (La Jolla, Cal.: University Associates, Inc.), 1976.*

DECISION MAKING

Abstract Participants in DELTA decision-making activities assessed their decision-making strategies with the use of a decision-making instrument and other self-assessment processes applied to simulated decision-making experiences. Activities included processing, feedback and comparison of different decision-making strategies. Group experiences were structured to: 1) help decision makers broaden or narrow alternatives, arrange priorities, consider values issues related to the outcomes, and project short-term and long-range outcomes; 2) allow participants to recreate previous decisions and to rehearse future decisions or conflict-resolution experiences; and 3) enable participants to set goals for themselves for improving and expanding decision-making strategies and identifying supportive colleagues.

Bolles, Richard N.: What Color Is Your Parachute? *(Berkeley: Ten Speed Press), 1978.*

Carkhuff, Robert: The Art of Problem Solving *(Amherst: Human Resources Development Press), 1973.*

Decision-Making Analysis (DMA): Unpublished instrument for the measurement of decision-making strategies (© 1977, Project DELTA, Wichita State University).

Harrison, E. Frank: The Managerial Decision-Making Process (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company), 1975.

McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., and Lowell, E.L.: The Achievement Motive (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts), 1953.

Scholz, Nelle T., Prince, Judith S., and Miller, Gordon P.: How to Decide (College Entrance Examination Board), 1975.

LEADERSHIP-STYLE ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Abstract Participants explored leadership and followership styles evident in their own and others' behavior by: 1) examining styles in relation to role expectations and to individual and group situations with various purposes and tasks; 2) exploring their perception of appropriate leadership and followership behaviors in reference to status, power, and organizational climate; and 3) identifying opportunities for expanding and refining leadership behaviors, and for emulating the leadership behavior of peers, role models, and mentors whose leadership style they admire.

Hennig, Margaret and Jardim, Anne: The Managerial Woman (Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday), 1977.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss: "Women in Organizations: Sex Roles, Group Dynamics, and Change Strategies," pp. 371-86 in Beyond Sex Roles, Sargent, Alice G. (St. Paul: West Publishing Company), 1977.

Lassey, William R.: "Dimensions of Leadership," pp. 10-15 in Leadership and Social Change, Lassey, William R., and Fernandez, Richard R., eds. (La Jolla, Cal.: University Associates, Inc.), 1976.

Past Reinforcement Measurement (PRM): Unpublished instrument for the measurement of leadership style (© 1977, Project DELTA, Wichita State University).

THE MALE CULTURE/THE FEMALE CULTURE: ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT LEADERSHIP

Abstract Role expectations and perceptions affect the ways in which males and females collaborate, compete, and communicate in interpersonal and professional relationships. Women may feel that the norms of organizational behavior are male-defined, while males may wonder whether social [attitudes and behaviors] toward females need to be modified in a professional setting. DELTA participants compared their perceptions of male organizational goals, leadership and followership behavior, and mobility strategies with their own by: 1) defining their own values and behaviors; 2) identifying male colleagues whose behaviors and strategies could be studied; and 3) making value decisions for modifying their behavior, for functioning effectively with male colleagues, and for clarifying the values they want to express in their own organizational behavior.

Aries, Elizabeth: "Male-Female Interpersonal Styles in All Male, All Female and Mixed Groups," pp. 292-99 in Beyond Sex Roles, Sargent, Alice G. (St. Paul: West Publishing Company), 1977.

Bem, Sandra L.: "Probing the Promise of Androgyny," pp. 47-62 in Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes, Kaplan, Alexandra and Bean, Joan, eds. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company), 1976.

Bem, Sandra L.: "Psychological Androgyny," pp. 319-24 in Beyond Sex Roles, Sargent, Alice G. (St. Paul: West Publishing Company), 1977.

Henley, Nancy and Thorne, Barrie: "Womanspeak and Manspeak: Sex Differences and Sexism in Communication, Verbal and Nonverbal," pp. 201-18 in Beyond Sex Roles, Sargent, Alice G. (St. Paul: West Publishing Company), 1977.

Kosinar, Patricia: A workshop design based on her work with Hennig, Margaret and Jardim, Anne: The Managerial Woman (Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday), 1977.

Roles, Goals, Values (RGV): Unpublished instrument for the measurement of sex-role values and attitudes (© 1977, Project DELTA, Wichita State University).

Roszak, Betty and Roszak, Theodore, eds.: Masculine/Feminine *(New York: Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, Publishers), 1969.*

Schaef, Anne Wilson: A workshop design presented at the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, March, 1977.

CHANGING ROLES OF MEN

Abstract Male and female colleagues can engage in communication activities which help them clarify role expectations and perceptions by examining the reinforcing effect of male and female socialization processes on male behavior. DELTA workshops enabled participants: 1) to compare male role perceptions with females' perceptions of those roles; and 2) to identify congruities and incongruities in men's view of themselves and their view of females' expectations for them. Such clarification became the basis for further examination of changing roles in interpersonal and professional relationships, and of role behaviors as they influence institutional climate and collegiality.

Farrell, Warren: The Liberated Man *(New York: Random House), 1974.*

Fasteau, Marc: The Male Machine *(New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1974.*

Goldberg, P.: "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?" pp. 28-30 in Trans-Action, *1968, 5 (s).*

Komarovsky, Mirra: Dilemmas of Masculinity *(New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.), 1976.*

UNDERSTANDING THE SYSTEM: IDENTIFYING LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

Abstract Many professional women wish to increase their understanding of system theory and to apply that knowledge to an understanding of their own organizational system. Colleagues with theoretical and experiential expertise were recruited to conduct sessions on: 1) the functioning of the formal and informal systems; 2) sources of formal and informal power; 3) university governance and committee roles; and 4) the decision-making and mission-defining system of the university. Participants identified issues which merited further study or issues on which leadership is limited or lacking. They discussed strategies for increasing the participation of women in administrative, governance, and ad hoc or entrepreneurial leadership roles, such as: 1) identifying power vacuums in present leadership opportunities; 2) increasing participation in professional organizations and other organizations which offer leadership opportunities; and 3) developing leadership issues within the curriculum. Leadership opportunities exist wherever exchanges of information, expertise, and energy are lacking, either within sub-systems within the institution, or between the university system and its supporting environment.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: Opportunities for Women in Higher Education *(New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1973.*

Cohen, Michael D. and March, James G.: Leadership and Ambiguity *(New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1974.*

Gross, Edward and Grambsch, Paul V.: University Goals and Academic Power *(Washington: American Council on Education), 1968.*

Richman, Barry M. and Farmer, Richard N.: Leadership, Goals, and Power in Higher Education *(San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers), 1974.*

LIFE PLANNING

Abstract While the development of five-year or ten-year plans is essential to the

planned advancement and upward mobility of women, it is possible to expand such planning activities to include a holistic approach to goal setting for personal, interpersonal, and professional growth. Activities which include the designing of life lines, trees of life, or other symbolic representations of plans for growth often reveal buried or unacknowledged hopes and expectations. Important features of DELTA life-planning activities included: 1) the sharing of aspirations for the development of support; and 2) an opportunity to imagine the institution and the society of the future, and the means by which the future might be shaped.

Chesler, Phyllis: Women, Money, and Power *(New York: William Morrow), 1976.*

Jongeward, Dorothy and Scott, Dru: Affirmative Action for Women: A Practical Guide *(Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.), 1974.*

Sheehy, Gail: Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life *(New York: Dutton), 1976.*

CHANGE-AGENT STRATEGIES

Abstract Individuals can increase their understanding of their own power, their ownership of their own leadership ability, and their appreciation for their ability to influence others and the system by examining their own change-agent behaviors as initiators or facilitators of change. DELTA activities enabled participants: 1) to identify specific techniques they had developed to create a positive environment for change; 2) to talk about the ways in which change enabled them to expand or redefine their self-concept; 3) to discuss the way in which they might elicit support for changing their own roles; 4) to identify changes they expect to make throughout the life cycle; 5) to share strategies for preparing for change; and 6) to discuss ways in which they might function as agents of change as colleagues within the institution.

Bird, Carolyn (Mandelbaum, Helene, ed.): How to Get Paid What You're Worth *(New York: David McKay Co.), 1973.*

Cohen, Michael D. and March, James G.: Leadership and Ambiguity *(New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1974.*

Frank, Harold: Women in the Organization *(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 1976.*

Swingle, Paul G.: The Management of Power *(Hillsdale, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers), 1976.*

STRESS MANAGEMENT

Abstract Professionals are becoming increasingly aware of the creative and the debilitating effects of stress on their health, relationships, professional performance, and the organizational climate. Participants in the DELTA stress-management workshop used a rating sheet to measure the stress caused by particular life experiences, professional roles, interpersonal relationships, and personal ambition. They learned ways to develop: 1) stress-reducing strategies; and 2) techniques for coping creatively with stress.

Seyle, Hans: The Stress of Life *(New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1976.*

Seyle, Hans: Stress Without Distress *(New York: Signet Books, The New American Library, Inc.), 1974.*

INSTITUTIONAL-ASSESSMENT AND POLICY-DESIGN ACTIVITIES

Abstract Women and men in leadership roles in the formal and the informal system can: 1) assess the obstacles to, and opportunities for, leadership of women and for the attainment of educational equity for the total university community; and 2) identify areas where women are under-represented in

leadership roles, in faculty positions, and in the student body. Colleagues with experiential expertise in equity issues, attitudes, and strategies were recruited to enable DELTA workshop participants to: 1) interpret this information; 2) form collaborative teams to formulate policies and programs to contribute to an institutional design for equity; 3) identify financial personnel or attitudinal-support priorities needed for implementation; and 4) assess their own expertise and commitment to effect change. Realizing that change agents may initiate the examination of equity issues, the ultimate design and implementation of an equitable institution must rest with participatory leaders who receive support and cooperation from colleagues who respect their values and their ability to contribute to justice.

Baldridge, J.V.: Power and Conflict in the University *(New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1971.*

Lippitt, Ronald, et al.: The Dynamics of Planned Change *(New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.), 1958.*

Obstacles and Opportunities for Women in Higher Education

Sheila Tobias

I used to think of my rather unorthodox career as having had no particular coherence. I began as a journalist working in Europe, interested in international affairs, especially the rise and impact of Naziism. I did graduate work in European history but never successfully completed the Ph.D. I returned to television journalism, taught at the college level for a while and then, in 1967, entered academic administration without having come up through the professorial ranks. In the course of the sixties, fired up by feminism, I created a new interdisciplinary field of women's studies (along with many others) and most recently have identified a new and important area for research and intervention, namely, mathematics anxiety.

As I talk to you now, I am on the brink either of a responsible position in higher education administration or of continued development of "math clinics" for women and men. In short, I never really planned to be doing what I am doing now, but rather followed my interests and my intuition.

Upon reflection, I would say today that there always was one underlying theme in that checkered career. My style was to try to find out where everyone was going (or ought to go) and then to "end-run" the pack. Perhaps the "end-run" model is something of use to other women seeking to get launched or to get ahead in their careers.

People think there is only one way to get where they want to go. In the case of academic administration, it is via the Ph.D. and long years of apprenticing through teaching and research, or via an advanced degree in student-personnel or higher education. Yet, if one can focus on the essential goals of higher education, it may be possible to get where everybody else is going faster by *not* going through the middle of the field. To wit: possibly more useful than a Ph.D. today in higher education administration is an M.B.A. or some competence in financial management. A group of women administrators in New England, recognizing this, have organized some training seminars for themselves precisely in those technical areas in which they feel least confident: financial management, computer data retrieval, grantsmanship, and long-range planning. Another "new" and important area is program evaluation research. By reading the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, one begins to notice that 10% of all federal grants are set aside for "evaluation" of programs to be funded. Who is going to do that "evaluation"? Who is going to comment on or evaluate the evaluators? This is a new, growing, and controversial field. If an academic administrator notices the trend, she is wise to get herself training in that area so that she can volunteer when her university discovers it needs some evaluation expertise.

Many people in the "nowness" of their vision do not do as well as people who step outside their fields and use their imaginations. Yet, it is especially hard for women to do that stepping outside. For one thing, it is often not certain until mid-career that we are going to have any career at all. Many of us start out hunting for a job and only later discover that our jobs have become long-lasting commitments to a field. Others of us are immobilized

---

Address delivered to the Project DELTA Design for Equity Faculty Luncheon for women faculty members and women non-teaching professionals, March 21, 1977.

in terms of our private lives. We are unable to move geographically or to afford further training or to change careers as easily as men. End-running, then, is not particularly easy for women to do, but is is still worthwhile thinking about how to get around the men.

My second point does not grow out of my own experience but out of counseling other, younger women than myself. It is rather frightening for a young person to contemplate at age 18 or 20 a career or a "plan" that will carry them through all of their working life. I find that it relieves them if I suggest that they consider their choices in terms of "Five-Year Plans." I think it is not only easier to make decisions only for the next five years but, given the rapid obsolescence of the fields in which we specialize, it is probably more realistic to plan this way than to try to arrange things for the longer term.

It also makes good-sense for people in mid-career to think in terms of five-year plans. If young people have difficulty thinking in longer terms than five years, older people, and especially older career women, often have difficulty thinking in terms as short as five years. Say you are an assistant registrar. Posing the five-year plan, you have to ask yourself whether you want to be assistant registrar in five years' time. Perhaps you do. Your real satisfaction comes from your family or from painting so it doesn't matter how much growth you experience on the job. But perhaps you don't want to stay in that slot. What are you doing about it now to get that situation changed?

A concomitant and often very disturbing question to ask oneself in mid-career is: where was I five years ago and where are the men who were at my level then, today? This can give us a personal measure of the limits of our opportunities, the extent, if any, of discrimination in our institution, and, finally, a sense of whether we are on an upwardly mobile track or standing still.

Two excellent books, *The Managerial Woman* and *Men and Women in the Corporation*, have recently been published. Both argue from different perspectives that women move less rapidly than men on the job for a variety of reasons, some of which are beyond our control but some of which are not. Being women, we are rarely promoted on our *promise*. Men are asked to do jobs they have not done before simply because they look competent at what they are doing now. Women remain at their level of competence and are not stretched to become competent at something new. As managers, women are not preferred, not because they are insensitive or poorly organized but because they do not have either formal or informal *power*, nor are they usually in a growth side of administration. Thus, people working for women perceive themselves to be in a dead-end, lacking in opportunity. Finally, women can be their own worst enemies: we can become so comfortable doing what we do well that we do not ask for promotion or for change; we do not delegate to newcomers; we do not tolerate a slightly lower standard of performance in order to get to do other things ourselves.

How then to redress the imbalance? If we are not promoted on our promise, how can we demonstrate to the people we work for that we have talents and ambitions beyond what we are doing now? One answer, again from my own career experience, is to gain leadership experience outside of one's own job. In New England, a group of women administrators organized a support group which, in turn, designed some proposals, applied successfully for funding, and managed a complex operation including personnel and financial matters. Then the group [members] returned, each to her own campus, better trained and more confident than before. Such experience can be taken from political organizations, [from] professional

caucuses, or by short-term exercises in leadership such as designing and running a conference (such as this one).

Another way of saying this is that if we cannot get the opportunities for growth that we need inside our institution, we must create parallel institutions on the outside where we can function as leaders. Getting outside the context of one's own work, traveling in new circles, doing at other places what one might not have the courage to do at home, these are the benefits of organized activities away from home and of extracurricular travel.

Finally, I think that what has characterized my own career is that I have treated it as a kind of work of art. As I progressed from interest to interest, instead of feeling guilty about abandoning an earlier focus each time, or being wary of trying something new, I merely revised my career self-image, fixed it up in one direction or another, changed some of the "colors," so to speak, or the "perspective," and moved on. The fact that I could think of my career this way means that from the beginning I was free of possibly the most pernicious sex-role socialization of all: the set of messages we get as girls that our lives are going to happen to us and not be the result of what we ourselves cause to occur.

A View of Equity on Campus

Marjorie Bell Chambers

As you design your plan for equality here on this campus, and under the Women's Educational Equity Act, I hope that it will be more than a paper model and more than a mathematical model, because there are some very deep social factors involved in our concepts of equality in this nation.

One can talk about Affirmative Action as the "AA" plan and sometimes people may think of it as Alcoholics Anonymous, and I'm afraid that some people look upon both with an equal kind of uneasiness. When one adds Title IX to Affirmative Action, one frequently hears cries of government interference in the natural order of things; and, of course, that order is the order that has been around since the year one. Change does not come easily, and change that is primarily on paper will seldom take effect unless changes of attitude accompany it. Affirmative Action, for too long, has been bemoaned as quotas or even discrimination in reverse and, of course, we have the famous Bakke case now before the courts.

But I would like to present both Affirmative Action and Title IX as offering real challenge and as an opportunity for universities to do basically what in the social studies or social sciences they do when they preach to students to build and create a social structure that is founded upon equity. There would be no need for Affirmative Action Plans if the "old boy system" of recommendation, promotion, and financial support had not been so inequitable, and if those outside the inner control system hadn't been overlooked and ignored for too long. If universities had engaged in the research of themselves to the same degree that they've researched other institutions of our society, and if they had acted upon those results as they demand government and other institutions do, they might have avoided all of the federal regulations which require them to do what they should have been doing all along anyway.

It was over two hundred years ago that this nation did announce to the world that it was founded upon the concept of all being created equal, and two hundred years later equality of opportunity to many still seems just a dream or an ideal for the future. So we do have Affirmative Action and we do have Title IX to nudge us along more rapidly than our two-hundred-year snail pace.

Pick up any university catalog and study the names of the regents and trustees, of the administrators and faculty. Women are seldom to be found in the former except as tokens of politicians and, perhaps, married to money. In the latter, they are found in the lower echelons of rank and at the bottom of the pay ladder. The university, of all places, ought to be the last place to tolerate discrimination of any sort, and the perpetuation on campus of the traditional social attitudes which demean women and minority-group members is certainly incompatible with the university's ideal search for truth. Affirmative Action has provided universities with a special opportunity for meaningful self-appraisal and analysis and the results of fully implementing such plans make a university a far greater institution of dynamic learning and for more students than ever before. Once the consciousness level of all administrators, faculty, and students is raised to full awareness of the inequality of the past and the psychic damage that it

Address delivered to the Project DELTA Design for Equity Faculty Luncheon and Workshop, March 29, 1977.

has caused in restricting lives and limiting horizons, then the university may embark upon a new era of exploring the truth from new perspectives.

The Affirmative Action Plan ought not be simply a chart of campus statistics to be compared with an estimated available pool of other qualified candidates so that goals could be established for future hiring. The really important thing is to ask the question, "Why?" Why are there only token women and minority full professors? And don't be satisfied with the traditional answers. It's all too easy to say that the pool is not available or that it has been limited in certain areas. It's very easy, in the case of women, to say that they have preferred to teach rather than do research and to publish, ignoring the fact that the "old boy system" has long permeated the traditional publishing outlets. Of course, women are changing that by devising their own new series of journals.

The importance in our society of "role modeling" as a part of our social conditioning is tremendous. Where does the female student on the campus find her role model that subtly tells her she, too, can be the university president, or the dean, or the full professor? And is the pay of the woman administrator and professor equal to her male counterpart? If not, why not, and are the reasons really valid?

Equal pay for equal work has been on the law books since 1963. Affirmative Action and Title IX do affect recruitment, retention, and even retrenchment. A.A.U.P. rules follow the same old song as other unions — last hired, first fired. And with women and minorities just beginning to be hired, they will be the first to be affected if universities do indeed have to go into retrenchment as demography seems to imply.

The aim of Affirmative Action is equity for all, and the end result cannot help but build a better climate on campus. A consistently applied personnel classification system and a consistently applied grievance procedure can clear the air of distrust. An equitable system, with known standards of rewards, promotions, salary increase, and merit pay, can release hidden talent and creativity, making the campus an exciting place to be. The growth of academia has too often been called "the academic jungle." If the university had a realistic system based on equity, the constant need for manipulation might disappear; the jungle would be cleared of deviousness and the grove restored.

But a university's reason for being is not the administration and the faculty, as much as some members of those groups may think it is, or would like it to be. It's the students and their education! That is the *raison d'être*. Affirmative Action and Title IX require that we analyze admissions, especially admissions to graduate and professional schools, for quotas and bias. Of course, today, with dropping enrollments of male students and increasing enrollments of women students, some of these barriers are breaking down. Each college or discipline needs students to keep their own payroll up and so, under the influence of events, women are becoming more welcome. And psychologists do tell us that attitudes and behavior will change when it's advantageous to change. Still, a young woman who applies for admission to engineering or veterinary medicine may find a strange reaction. Will she be told, as my younger daughter was told not too long ago, "You're too small to deliver a foal or a calf"? Why not let her learn for herself and hire, if necessary, a brawny assistant?

Is financial assistance equal in the number of scholarships and fellowships for both men and women? And do they both have equal access to those which do not differentiate? Is financial aid administered on the basis of merit and need alone? But perhaps more important from the standpoint of women, is equal consideration given for part-time students as well as for full-time students?

Here is a whole area where the university needs to engage in some innovative design: meeting the needs of the part-time student with residency requirements, with transfer of credits, with repetitive patterns of course offerings, with allowance for even full-time employment, and certainly with age limitation. Restrictions in these areas fall heaviest upon minority groups and women. And women in particular do lead "disjointed" lives, with pregnancy and child rearing, and being in and out of the job market, to say nothing of that phenomenon of the campus marriage, which enables the husband to continue his studies while the wife drops hers to go to work to support them both. Changing demographic patterns forecast fewer students of traditional age groupings but perhaps more students of middle age, wanting to change careers in mid-stream, or, in the case of women divorced or widowed, who suddenly must support themselves and having no training with which to do so.

Traditional enrollment patterns and inflexibilities have too often led to separate departments of Continuing Education which teach non-credit or non-degree applicable courses. The whole area of counseling comes into play if one is going to build a campus of equity. Academic counseling has tended to be sex-stereotyped, advising women, in effect, to stay where they belong: in home economics, in elementary education or early childhood education, in social work, or, if they're absolutely convinced that they do want a liberating education, then they are escorted into the humanities. But why not mechanical engineering and architecture, and why not physics and mathematics? What have we done to young women to convince them that they're incapable of counting, or multiplying, or dividing, or solving problems? We've culturally crippled them by denying them the fun of playing mathematical games, by not involving them in the discussion of batting averages, by convincing them that it's more important to be seen as cheerleaders in costumes than to be scorekeepers and game statisticians.

I consider myself proof of the pudding. I'll admit I'm a little bit out of the age range of today's students, but still I was fortunate enough to have a father who did involve me in athletics and in number games. And in high school, I was the only female student who went beyond introductory algebra. And finally on the SAT math, I had a perfect 800. But when the Dean of Admissions of my alma mater asked me why I had not signed up for any freshman math course, I replied, with a perfectly socially conditioned answer, "I had all the math I need to buy the groceries." Later on, I married a physicist, and I've raised three scientific children, and I certainly wished I had more math. I met it in a course on education in teaching the new math and discovered that I could really still do math. When we had the chapters on the theory, I was the only student who understood it. When we had the applications, all of the other teachers were right there.

But women do require special counseling, socially, vocationally, and health-wise. And they need values clarification, to sort out their real personal values from those society has traditionally imposed upon them. They need to be introduced to concepts of life planning as well as career planning in order that their disjointed lives may, somehow or other, have a plan. Particularly today, women students need special services to help them deal with equality, assertiveness training, and child care, and student life workshops on leadership training to enable them to develop their potential for assuming initiative and responsibility. After all, they were taught how to read with, "Look, Jane, look. Watch *Dick* throw the ball!" And they might be just a little bit timid about assuming leadership.

The academic programs of some departments appear to have changed little. I am inclined to say, since medieval days, or perhaps the nineteenth century, but certainly since the Second World War. Truth was ordained years ago from the male perspective, dealing exclusively with male interests. And even traditional women professors teach the male point of view because that was how they were taught. The textbooks they studied were written by men and offered no other perspective. For a woman to be a scholar was to follow the only model she had, the "male model." Women's Studies, like Black Studies, Chicano Studies, and Indian Studies, have their academician detractors. The criteria are debated along traditional scholarship lines. Yet surely, as modern society increases in complexity, and scholarship becomes more heavily and narrowly specialized, interdisciplinary studies, with varying perspectives, should have more relevance and ought to provide us with greater understanding of contemporary problems.

A society committed to equality that has been patriarchal in form has a tremendous job to build a new system of equity. The university grew out of the middle ages to produce baccalaureate-licensed teachers of men, male clergy for the church universal, male lawyers for the male king, and male physicians for the aristocracy. The university is an institution designed for another era of human life. And the American version, particularly its extension into the practical arts of engineering and agriculture, is still a male institution which women have been invited to attend. Too many women still sit silently in the classroom, rarely questioning the male professor's lecture.

Most faculty members *are* male. Administration is predominantly male and the university serves men and trains them for traditional male careers. The language of the classroom is masculine, and the analysis of the material is usually from a male perspective. And the textbooks rarely contain the noun "woman" or the pronoun "she." Those professors who do occasionally talk of persons and say "he or she" are certainly respected by the young woman whose consciousness has been raised. Since the 1880s, when women began entering the universities, they have rarely complained about this totally masculine world because they were so anxious to be a part of it. But today, their consciousness *has* been raised to the point that an all "he" lecture in history, philosophy, or even science tends to turn women students off. And words like "brotherhood" and "mankind" and "man" are no longer heard by women as generic references in anthropology. Dear old Freud, the father of psychiatry, posed the question, "Good God, what is it that women want?" His problem was that he saw women and their "problem" from a male perspective. Women were to be seen and not heard, as mothers, wives, and daughters. They had no other role in life. Unlike men, who can choose almost any career in addition to being husbands, fathers, and sons, women have been seen in their sexual role.

What do women want from Affirmative Action and Title IX? An end to discrimination, both overt and covert, and equity in all things, but most of all, to be seen as individuals rather than stereotypes, to be recognized as human beings of dignity and worth, possessing mental and intuitive capacities far beyond those needed simply to manage a home and to perform volunteer service in the community. Women, today, are asking for equality of opportunity with men, for full participation in all areas of career life and citizenship, to be part of the decision-making process in a nation committed for over two hundred years to that revolutionary concept that all are created equal. Let this be the foundation for your design for equality.

A Decision for Equity: The Advancement of Women in Higher Education Administration

Thomas M. Stauffer

I address academic audiences with reasonable regularity — some are more significant for me than others. My remarks here at Wichita State this afternoon fall in my "significant" category; the advancement of women in administration is important for the advancement of American higher education. Please permit me a personal account of why I believe this.

When Sally Kitch wrote me in February about this assignment, she said that I had been invited because "you have made equity in higher education administration one of your personal priorities." It is nice that someone noticed, although I am distressed that someone has to make a point of noticing. Thus, it is significant, perhaps just for approval, that my efforts are recognized, but you should know that I consider involvement in equity a matter of routine. None of us should be recognized for what each of us should do as a matter of course. I try to advance human liberation simply because my values tell me that it is the right thing to do. And this is not unselfish on my part. The more equity, the better I will feel.

So, as I hope you can see, my approach to the question of women in academic administration is quite simple. I am more of a reductionist, I guess, than a psychoanalyst. Erica Jong and many other feminist writers get so heavily involved in deep analysis that I sometimes feel that they lose sight of practical priorities. But I am of the school that believes that simplicity is one of those penultimate values, good in architecture, style, policy, thought, language, and daily routine.

With that background, let me further explain the basis for my personal attitude on equity and my professional involvement with the question. As I look back on it — and I had not thought this thing through beforehand — I came to my simple notion that equity in higher education should be among my personal priorities for three reasons:

First, I know dozens of competent women in academic administration — Carolyn Davis at Ann Arbor, Pat Graham at the Radcliffe Institute, Kala Stroup at Lawrence, Kansas, Hilda Richards at Medgar Evers, Marjorie Bell Chambers at Colorado Women's College and Alice Emerson at Wheaton, Carol VanAlstyne and Emily Taylor at ACE, Norma Tucker at Merritt College and Pat McFate at Penn, Alice Beeman at Case, Mary Metz at Hood College and Lois Rice at the College Entrance Examination Board, and Mary Berry and Willa Player at HEW, and so on — and I am unable to distinguish that they have lesser ability because of their sex. I can also give you a long list of women who did not succeed in higher education administration but I can match every name on that list with the names of five men. Sex, in short, is not, in my experience, a determinant of managerial, or leadership, or academic competence.

Second, when it comes to the law of the land, I am what Mr. Nixon used to call a "strict constructionist," although he may have had another notion in mind about the precise definition. Like Senator Sam Erwin, I believe in acting on what the U.S. Constitution does, in fact, say. Whether ERA eventually gains required approval or not, it requires a minimum of inter-

Address delivered to the Project DELTA Design for Equity Workshop for persons in key administrative and leadership roles at W.S.U., April 29, 1977.

pretation to arrive at the conclusion that the Constitution stresses in several places, directly and indirectly, the importance of equality under the law. It is constitutionally — as affirmed by Congress and Executive Orders — wrong to do anything to bar women from leadership posts in academic administration and it is ethically wrong not to do everything possible to work to overcome such barriers as may exist.

Third, the American academy needs all the help it can get in its struggle to maintain quality in teaching, research, social criticism, public service, and perpetuation of world culture. It is merely short-sighted of us not to enlist the best talent there is; if that proposition is correct, then race, sex, and the other myriad variables that divide humankind simply have no place.

My professional opportunity to act on these observations and beliefs has come through the leadership-development programs I operate at the American Council. The number of women and minorities in these activities has quadrupled, while standards of selection have also increased substantially. I will not take time now to explain how, beyond noting that it all boils down to encouraging others to act in ways that they know are right and to exercising common sense. Through many devices, I have communicated to ACE's constituency, which consists of the major college and university presidents and chief academic officers in the U.S., that nominating women and minorities for leadership development programs and then picking up most of the cost, is something that they must do for reasons of enlightened self-interest and statespersonship. All this happened by the way, after "affirmative action" programs were well underway but not yielding meaningful results. I discovered that calls for leadership on equity did work, not in every case, still not even in a majority of cases, but a significant result was realized.

This progress generally has not been matched by affirmative action programs on campuses nationwide. Progress in bringing equity in salaries, promotion, and tenure decisions has not been nearly as extensive as affirmative action advocates had hoped. In academic administration, a recent study by Carol VanAlstyne, ACE's chief economist, and Julie Withers of the College and University Personnel Association, indicated that in higher education, 80% of administrative posts are held by white males and salaries of women have lagged significantly behind those men in comparable positions in administration, or at 80% of white male salaries. This lag they found to be sex linked rather than race linked and found that "affirmative action officer" was the only one of 52 administrative job categories where women and minorities were in the majority.

Further, ACE's Office of Women recently found that there were only 154 women in college and university presidencies in 1976 (compared with 148 a year earlier) or 5% of 2926 institutions examined. Of the 154, 69% are in religious orders and 63% head institutions of under 1000 students; only 5 head large public institutions and 71 of the 154 head institutions for women. There is scant help from the Federal government; the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is in chaos, with a backlog of over 200,000 cases, and affirmative action appears to have brought more prosperity to the classified section of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* than to fair treatment of women and minorities when selections of top administrators are made.

Such lack of progress is especially distressing because it flies in the face of what most American academicians profess to represent: a liberal attitude in politics and civil rights, actually the most liberal of U.S. occupational groups. Everett Ladd and Seymour Martin Lipset in their 1975 sample

survey of the American academy found that 57% supported McGovern in 1972 versus 31% of college-educated Americans generally, although academics are not the radicals the public often envisions. Generally the more liberal faculty members are at more prestigious schools and they publish more. Yet in spite of the liberal politics of over half of academics, there is less liberalism on internal matters at institutions, including promotion, tenure, and equity.

Such professions of liberalism do not appear to apply inside the academy itself. On selection of professional colleagues, we prescribe for the rest of the society what we do not prescribe for ourselves. It echoes outlines of the present debate on the supposed excessive government regulation of higher education. While allowing for bureaucratic excesses and bungling, is it not really a matter of whose ox is gored? Academicians, notably in the Kennedy-Johnson years, led the way for more regulations to right social wrongs, apparently never dreaming that their regulations would come back to haunt them. Then came the cry: "Foul." Well before the regulations go, should we not consult the *raison d'être* for public regulation in the first place? The wide-spread contradictions in the academy between words and deeds is something to which all of us should give the most earnest consideration. The populists' charge that most academicians are "limousine liberals," easily dismissed, has some basis in fact, I believe. The image of higher education is not as good nationally as it once was and I believe our hypocrisy has something to do with it; essentially, we get what we deserve.

Another ACE survey, by Elizabeth Tidball, entitled *Survey of Teaching Faculty*, found that most male professors are cool to women's issues. Males are far less concerned with such issues as discrimination and anti-nepotism than are female professors, and male and female professors are more supportive to students of their own sex. Males become more supportive of women if they teach at women's colleges.

This workshop is being held to design policies to correct inequities which block the full participation of women in higher education administration. I would hope that such policies will also help other groups, including white males. Well, from my analysis to this point, I hope you guess correctly that, like Governor Jerry Brown and others, I am skeptical that policies, *qua* policies, will do much good. Affirmative action is a policy, after all, and it has not done much good. In fact, I recommend to women and minorities who come to me for advice on careers in academic administration — and I am heavily involved in career development nationwide — that, if they are talented administratively, they should not get syphoned off as the "house woman" or "house black" as an affirmative action officer. Their higher calling must be core administration — deanships, vice presidencies, and presidencies — and they must engage in research, public and institutional service, teaching, and professional service to earn the respect of their colleagues. There are no short-cuts, and there should be none.

The fact that affirmative action officers are needed is a *de facto* sign of failure of the affirmative action policies. If equity were a part of the daily routine of faculty members and administrators, affirmative action officers would not be needed. The same is true for ombudsmen; if problems were handled correctly as a matter of routine, a complaint department would not be needed. Affirmative action offices too often are addenda to core administration, more window dressing to benefit federal examiners than institutionally functional. Carol VanAlstyne, in her study, found that the presence of an affirmative action office on campus has no, I repeat *no*, impact on the advancement of women in higher education administration.

There was no statistical difference on equity between those campuses which had such officers and those which did not.

So I conclude that policies are only a second step. The first requirement for equity is the will that it should be realized. This may strike you as obvious but I sometimes wonder whether all our manipulations of policies merely result from lack of will, the lack of willingness to make the hard decisions needed to make equity, as other things, a reality. It has been my experience at the American Council on Education that when the president and chief academic officer especially, but also faculty members and deans, will that equity be a part of their institutions, as a matter of routine, then the policies will follow which will yield successful results. Where there is no real will, then policies will have no impact. Equity and inequity are matters of choice. When choosing those who make this crucial choice, care must be taken that the will for equity is there. This is not a novel solution but a time-honored one; make sure that institutional leaders have the commitment to make, rather than avoid, the tough decision. Screen administrators, in particular, for their commitment to equity.

From that selection decision — and questions about equity should not be the only ones put to prospective administrators — policies will follow which will correct past inequities and make equity standard operating practice. Then the innate liberalism among higher education professionals will assert itself and we will all feel proud for what we have done. Will-power, followed by hard decisions, followed by pride — that prospect, I submit, is not unattractive.

136

Women's Equity as a University Priority

Marjorie Downing Wagner

Being a member, as I now am, of a central administration, I've had too few opportunities since I took this position in September to be on campuses. I was delighted, therefore, to accept Carol's invitation to come to Wichita State and to renew my acquaintance, minimal as it is, with Kansas, and to see you for the first time. It is indeed therapeutic for a bureaucrat like me to be on a campus, and it's particularly refreshing and rewarding to be part of what must have been for all of you, and for most of you working closely with this project, a very rewarding experience. One of the good things that our federal bureaucracy does is, now and then, have enough sense to hand out some money, not lots, but some, to universities and colleges, to do the kinds of things that you're doing. And whatever the results are, there is always, in my experience, a by-product of growth in community feeling among all those who are working on a project, difficult as it is to confront some of the issues that you're confronting in a women's equity program. Nonetheless, it means that there are all kinds of new perspectives, enriched visions, and certainly friendships and relationships that are going to be lasting for all of you. And so as I say, for me, coming into this is like making new friends and I am very grateful to be here.

The condition we face is not one that I think we need to draw out too long. It reminds me a little bit of an Israeli joke that I heard when I was recently in Israel visiting the universities. One of the great things about an Israeli trip is that you're constantly surrounded by wonderful Jewish jokes that are mostly, I think, imported from New York into Jerusalem. But as a New Yorker, I feel very at home with them. They were telling us a story about a young man who was, as all of them are, in the military. And he had to have the experience that most of them have to have, which is jumping from an airplane and parachuting so that he would be able to take on that chore if necessary. He was terribly apprehensive about it. And they said, "It's really all right. You don't have to worry. When you do jump, you have a parachute and if that parachute doesn't open, you have an emergency rip cord and you pull that and that's a back-up parachute and there will be no problem." So he relaxed a bit and they said, "There'll be a jeep at the field, and when you land the jeep will take you back to headquarters." And so he went up and he took the usual ten deep breaths and jumped and he pulled the rip cord, and indeed, the parachute did not open. And so he counted the proper number of seconds and pulled the second one and the second one did not open and he said, "Now all I should need is that the jeep won't be there."

It's a little bit like our situation in higher education, which is, I think, sufficiently full of uncertainty and indeed, current dismay, to make one wonder whether there will be a jeep someplace on the ground.

We, of course, in California, and you in Kansas, and all across the States are recognizing some harsh realities. We have come through the hysterical, exciting, and seemingly endless period of growth. And we're all facing the hard fact of declining enrollments. Those of us in public institutions, dependent on state funding based on a formula-driven budget, based on full-time enrollment, have had to accept reduced funding. The effect on faculty, the effect on staff, the effect on the programs, and the effect on

Address delivered to the Project DELTA Design for Equity Workshop for persons in key administrative and leadership roles at W.S.U., April 29, 1977.

137

students, all of these are what we are now contemplating, examining, exploring, and viewing with alarm. The morale, and I cannot suppose it is different at Wichita State than anywhere else, the morale is low. At my nineteen institutions in California, we have some 13,000-16,000 faculty members. Six thousand of those faculty members are part time and temporary. That's a large percentage and we have it for reasons that are, I think, understandable: the richness of the programs, the flexibility of the programs; but those people are now particularly on the first line of what will happen next. Tenure is harder to come by, and there's no question that somewhere down the road we're going to have to look at layoff of tenured faculty. These things are having the usual understandable effects on the morale. It's particularly difficult for young people who have had great hopes for their careers. It's particularly difficult for young men and young women, who look at each other with suspicion, and hostility, and, indeed, anger and fear: what will happen to you if this happens to me, and so forth. The programmatic loss, I think, is very serious because we all know what part-time and probationary faculty can do for us. We all know the inroads on the program when those people have to be let go.

Students are having reactions. Programs are being seriously threatened by the kinds of cutbacks that we're having to make. Students are in a state of confusion about the value of a college education in the first place. When you measure the value of an education by its economic effect, you come to some conclusions that perhaps are not necessarily sound but certainly have enough smoke in them to make you think there's fire, that this economic payoff is not as great as it might have been in the past, and may not continue to be great; so students are worried and confused about going to college and the university. You have, consequently, great shifts in student demands. Students are moving into programs where they think there *is* some kind of economic payoff: the health professions, criminal justice, business administration, the law. And what's happening there is that we'll surely, sooner or later, see a glut on the market in those areas.

Those of us in public institutions like this one have particular responsibilities and responsiveness to public concern. The disillusionment with higher education felt in the sixties by the public has had what seems like unending effects. The public is not happy with us. The public is not sympathetic to the faculty. One of my tasks is to present to legislative committees and to the governor a request proposal for increased sabbatical leaves and for faculty development, for all those things that we know are enormously important to the vitality and the regenerative quality of the institutions. And I find deaf ears. If they're listening at all, they're hostile ears. The public is not happy with us. "The faculty doesn't work very much. It's only a twelve-hour teaching load." How can you propose to the public that there should be special needs for development and that sort of thing? "What is this sabbatical? I get postcards from my neighbor who is skiing in the Alps, while I'm working and he's on a sabbatical. What's happening?" "What about those people in business administration who run their own businesses on the side and teach two days a week on a full teaching load?"

This is the kind of question that the public asks, and it asks it through the legislature. So the legislature becomes again an enormously important pressure group. Currently, the California Assembly Committees are using our budget hearings, which have just begun in the last couple of weeks, to get at all sorts of questions that have been nagging at them for some time. What about those things? They have questioned the University of California on the time that their faculty members are giving to consulting with

government agencies, thus, we think, reaching to the very heart of the nature of the faculty experience in a way that is somewhat threatening, requiring full disclosure of everything that a faculty member is earning other than his own salary.

These requests have some pretty serious implications. We go then to the governors, [in] Wisconsin, Maine, Massachusetts, who agree when he says we must reorder our priorities. That falls heavily on academic ears, on those of us who have been so long in the academy, who for so many years There are many other governors across this nation, especially our young governors, Wisconsin, Maine, Massachusetts, who agree when he says we must reorder our priorities. That falls heavily on academic ears, on those of us who have been so long in the academy, who for so many years have dedicated our lives, committed our time and energy to what we think is the highest priority, the education of our people, the transformation of our society. That notion of reordering our priorities, understandable as it is, with the condition of mental hospitals, with the condition of our prisons, with our criminal system, all of those things we understand; but the reordering of our priorities to put education at the bottom falls upon our ears with a clang of some doom.

So we come here to talk about equity for women. What a time this is for equity for women! In the late sixties and certainly the early seventies, we *were* in a position where we could say with less threat certainly than now, that it was a time when women could expect movement in academia. The statistics were horrifying; the facts were clear. Women were not receiving their due and just deserts. They were not being paid as much as men for the same kinds of jobs. They were not rising on the academic administrative ladder. They were not being admitted to graduate schools in the kinds of numbers that they should have been admitted in. All that was true in the late sixties. But things began to happen that gave us hope and gave some hope, I think, to the society that certainly must support equity. We had the Education Act of 1972; we had equal opportunity; we had affirmative action; we had all those laws that were passed. That, at least, was a stage of hope. Now we know, I think, that like other times for women's movements toward freedom and the acceptance of new responsibilities, other times after the Civil War, after the First World War, and after the Second World War, there was a relapse, a falling away of the kinds of advances that had been made through the Abolitionist Movement for women, through the advances toward suffrage which were made in the 1920s, and again through the kinds of varieties of jobs that women were able to hold, like Rosie the Riveter, in the Second World War. All those things also had the backlash and the falling away, and we think that perhaps this is a time like that for us, a kind of relapse. Is it?

I think there's no question that affirmative action has not produced the intended results. When Tom Stauffer comes this afternoon, I'm sure he'll talk to you about an ACE study that is not yet published that's been done by Carole Grenault Stein on women in higher education administration. What has Affirmative Action done for them? Without turning even to that study at the moment, let's just look at the figures. Your DELTA group has offered you a great deal of data, all recent, all hard, and all important. We really haven't changed much. Twenty to twenty-five percent of faculties in this nation are women. There were twenty-eight percent fifteen years ago. The percentage is falling off. The salary differential remains between five and six thousand dollars. That's a fact. And the fact is, of course, that women are crowding the lower ranks and not the upper ranks. I need only to point to your own university, where you have only four full professors who are

women in this institution. We haven't gotten very far. Women in the support staff, as well, simply do not hold the upper positions.

In the nineteen colleges and universities of my system, there are no women business managers. There are two women personnel officers, although one would think that this is an obvious place for the kinds of talent and training that women have. There are two women vice-presidents for administration. There are three women academic vice-presidents. We are proud of them, and indeed of this number, small as it is. I was the first woman president in the state of California in a four-year public institution. That produced some rather amusing, somewhat bittersweet episodes in my life. I was, also, I discovered when I was appointed, only the second woman president of a four-year public institution in the whole country. The other woman retired and there I was — all alone.

I think that what we are recognizing is that the numbers of women in academic administration are very small indeed. We have just had, for example, one woman now appointed to be the president of Vassar. Virginia Smith, who was the director of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education, has now been named to Vassar. This does mean that our so-called Seven Sisters have more women presidents than men, but there are still at least many of the women's colleges, those that are left, that still insist on finding men as their presidents rather than women. They feel strongly that a man is necessary because they think that men raise money better than women. I would challenge that anywhere. That is just not true. But this is the kind of perception that distorts the opportunities that affirmative action could give us. And I think among us all the private colleges are better off than the public institutions. Eighteen percent at the moment, of administrators in private colleges are women, and only thirteen percent in public insitutions, and these, as I say, at not very high levels. The salary differential is bad, worse in public institutions. The ACE report indicates that. Yet, with all this, there have been changes and I would like now, just for a moment, to suggest a more positive note.

The fact is that we're here today and, the fact is that federal money and state money and private funds are going into training workshops and programs for interns, such as your Kellogg program. In our system, we are running a two-week program for women administrators and faculty ourselves this summer. There has been for some time, formerly funded by Carnegie, an Institute for the Advancement of Women in Administration at the University of Michigan and now moved to Wisconsin. There are, and have been for the last five years, programs of this sort that do much more than simply raise consciousness. We are beyond the consciousness-raising stage, I feel. We have come to the point where action and policy must follow; and I think this, your presence and mine today, means that we are moving where we have not moved before.

Of course, we have the law and the courts. There is no question that economic exploitation will have a serious setback given the courage of individuals who will go through the grievance procedures and, if they are not satisfactory, to the courts and be supported by the courts. Last week in California, a Federal appeals court upheld a lower court ruling that women should *not* be required to pay more into their pension funds than men because they happen to have the misfortune or the good fortune to live longer. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power women brought the case. They were paying 15 percent more into their annual pension funds than men in the same position, and the appeals court upheld their protest. We're getting, all through the courts, this kind of support. I'm sure you all observed recently this week on television the hearings for the

maternity-leave benefits that were being carried on in the Congress. You saw the NAM view with alarm the possible expense it would be to our great corporations if they were to treat women's maternity leave like sick leave. I think we saw some very interesting support from Congressional leaders for women in that case. So I think that with the courts and with government support, at least legal inequities and economic exploitations will begin to disappear. But that's just the floor.

We're talking here together in the academy, in an institution of higher learning, in an institution that prides itself on being a university. What does this mean? This is the *place* to talk. It is wrong, it seems to me, to expect General Motors, or the NAM, to move women's equity forward if the university is not taking the lead. This is the place where society is served and where society is subtly but inexorably changed. Those are the roles and the missions of a university. I would suggest that the dedication to women's equity is to the *advantage* of the university as an institution. It's not only to the advantage of its individual members. I would say that even on the grounds of enlightened self-interest, women's equity is of importance to the *institution*.

Now let me just point out what else is involved in paying attention to women. You're going to have more women students than men students. You're already having more applications from women than you are from men, if you're like the institutions I know. You're going to have more women at the gates expecting programs that will respond to them and to their needs and you're going to have male faculty finally paying attention, including male faculty in women's colleges, not just in public institutions, paying attention to what they're really doing there. What is really *happening* with the student population? You're having numbers and numbers of women returning after interrupted educational experience, exciting people returning to the classrooms, vital, motivated, not sitting around thinking about when they can get out to football practice, but working at whatever it is they are doing and making the teacher's life good again. Those women are there. They're also bringing money with them, especially in the summer session extension programs, which does help to support parts of the university that are finding it hard to support themselves on their own. So that just in terms of enlightened self-interest, I think you will discover that paying attention to women is important.

As to the kinds of programs that women are developing, I'm fully aware, as you all are, of the shadows that fall on things like women's studies; I'm fully aware of the disdain and concern that people have about such programs, are they academically respectable, and so forth. I can assure you that my experience with them is that they are not only academically respectable, they are in the forefront of exploring some very important research topics, impacting on genetic studies, impacting on literary studies, impacting on history. The kinds of things that can be done in women's studies are really important academically, but, again with enlightened self-interest in mind, are also drawing students. It's such programs as these that I am concerned about as being threatened by the loss of temporary and part-time faculty, because they are so often staffed that way.

Having said that, I am saying something that I personally disapprove of, because I think it simply continues the whole notion of using women for other ends than their own. It's making use of people. I think one of my favorite remarks of Henry James is his statement that the worst thing you can do to another person is to use her or him. And I think this is to use women to the ends of the institution in ways that, while perhaps necessary, are not necessarily admirable.

I think what we must do is look, finally, at the real reason, at the important reason, that women's equity is a first priority for an institution like this and for all of our public institutions. That is, essentially, the mission of a university. For me and for you, this university is here to *serve* society, and in serving it, it must observe it and it must, in certain ways, remain aloof from it and be critical of it. No one, I think, in his right mind could sit back and admire the society we now have. It has all the ruthlessness, mechanism, impersonalism, indeed, destructiveness, that one can think of. It is not something that we want to further. It's something we certainly want, I think, to change subtly.

I believe the university, in spite of its traditional conservative role, is a force for revolution, and I think that we are engaged with the women's movement in a profound and lasting revolution. It is, of course, a furthering of the notions of the renaissance of individualism. I think it is certainly a necessary and inevitable concomitant of the scientific and industrial revolution, which, in themselves, have helped to create the depersonalization that we see now. There isn't any way to turn back from this kind of revolution. It is here and I think it is the role of the university for its life and its vigor and its credibility to support it and to work with it.

I ask you, what would such a civilization, such a society, be like? Just think about the characteristics of a society in which both men and women were truly liberated. What would it be like? It would recognize a stream of concern that runs throughout our nation, a humanistic concern, recognizing the complex development and potentiality of individuals. The kind of society which would have *that* as its chief priority would be a different kind of society from the one we have now, an infinitely preferable one, and a rich one. It would be a kind of world in which *persons* were more important than roles, in which *community* was more important than separation, in which the *institutions* became the working of all of us for the same goals, where faculty members and students and administrators and staff were really dedicated to the fullest education of the individual and the impact that that would have on that society. That is the kind of world I think that the women's movement moves toward, and I'm not talking about its extremes, necessary as they may have been. I'm talking about the kind of structured and thoughtful process that is going on in your workshop. That's the kind of world I think we can look forward to *if* men and women together will liberate us from their constraints and their stereotypes.

It seems to me that these changes are practical. The practicality of them one leaves to the institution itself because they vary with the uniqueness and the ambience of the institution, but they come essentially from the leadership. They are there for presidents, because the president's role is enormously important in continuously creating the nature of an institution. They come from the president; they come from administrative leaders; they come from faculty leadership, this kind of leadership. They come from staff leadership; they come from the kinds of leadership you get from your students. Changes depend on how the leaders will respond to certain key questions that every institution of higher learning must answer: the one that's relevant here is how does every action, every policy, every practice, square with that mission and that goal of opening up our society, with enriching the personal, individual goals and lives of the people involved in this institution, with unlocking the enormous talent that is in this room, the dedication that's in this room, the enormous experience, the complexities of suffering, struggle, joy that's in each of the people involved in this kind of workshop? In my own role, this is the question I have to ask myself every day. What is it that I have done today that has

furthered that? And what is it that has not furthered it? What have I done to inhibit the very goals to which I have dedicated my life? Administrators can ask themselves that every minute of the day because, as we know, the slightest, most unimportant decision can begin to be the pebble in the water that starts the ripple, the concentric circle touching everything.

I would say the most important characteristic of anybody engaged in a university is a questioning mind, a kind of self-examination that is daily and continuous. If no life is worth living that is not self-examined, that certainly must be true of university faculty and administrators of confidence that whatever situation we're in, we have an opportunity because we look at it as a challenge.

Things are bad, but this is the time. This is not the time when we throw up our hands and say, "No time for women. We have too many other important things to do." This is the time that we look forward and do the things that have to be done.

What's Next for Women in Higher Education?

Barbara Uehling

When I was called and asked to come here, I wasn't given a topic, but I was asked to talk in general about some encouraging things that we, as individuals might do, in view of the fact that some of us are a little bit discouraged about the Women's Movement. That led me to consider the question of just where we are with regard to the Women's Movement. We talked a lot about the women's movement. That led me to consider the question of just where we are with regard to the women's movement. We talked a lot

When I was in New England, I used to fly on a certain eastern air line and it was one of those more exciting airlines when you weren't quite sure whether you were going to get where you were going or whether it was going to leave on time. So, the story goes that one day a passenger reported to this particular air line, boarded confidently, took off down the runway, and then they stopped suddenly, turned around and went back. So the person, who was really not a very eager passenger, inquired of the stewardess, "What's wrong?" The stewardess said, "Well, the pilot believes that he's heard a noise in the engine, and so we're going to go back." They were on the ground only five minutes, and they started taxiing out again. The passenger was not reassured by all this, and so he again inquired of the stewardess, "What have you done? What could you possibly have done in five minutes to rectify this situation?" She said, "It was easy. Changed pilots."

Sometimes I feel that the kinds of changes that we may be undergoing in the women's movement are like that story—that there's some gloss, but not really enough substance. So I want to talk a little bit about that, as to whether that *is* the case or not, in my view, and then talk about some of the things that we might do.

When I sat making notes for this talk, I realized that in the state of Oklahoma the ERA has not been ratified, as is true for a number of other states, and that is cause for discouragement. It's true that the need to pass the ERA has even brought out opposition among some women, which may be hindering some of the rights and opportunities that we thought we had before we even attempted the ERA.

When I stop to look at the status of women's studies courses, I feel we've made some progress. I certainly feel after visiting with some of you people today that you've made progress here, and I feel as we look around the country that some of those programs are surviving and becoming well-integrated and are more than just tolerated. They are even accepted and, in some cases, welcomed. But I still feel that we have a lot of tokenism — I think I'm more aware of tokenism than I ever have been, although I must say in all fairness, at the University of Oklahoma I've never felt that I was a token appointment. But I am aware of it, and I think that tokenism can cause problems and result in hindrances. I also find that men are still needing to rationalize the lack of equality, and that very many times when I go someplace to speak in another state or in talking with people, they'll say, "We hired a woman in our state this year." So I realize that we haven't made as much change as we would like, and that is disappointing.

If you look at the picture historically, however, I think there are some im-

Address delivered to the Project DELTA Design for Equity Welcome-Back Reception, August 30, 1977.

portant changes going on. Fifty-five years ago, one in every five people in the labor force was a woman. Today, it's two in every five. We also find that, as we look at what those women are doing, they have greater opportunities than women did previously. There's much greater diversity now than there was even a decade ago. So while we still find some significant limitations, if we look at professional women, we find that about forty percent of them are in teaching or in the health service professions. So there's not as much opportunity or as much diversity as we would like. But we still find there is increasing diversity. We find that, when we look at pay, that the median salary for women last year, according to the U.S. Labor Bureau, was three-fifths that of men. So, that is progress, but it's still not equity. We still haven't come as far as we would like.

We have some mechanisms to try to correct this situation. We look at the E.E.O.C. and find that the average time to settle a complaint, according to the *Wall Street Journal* I was reading the other day, is two years. There is a backlog of 130,000 cases there, and they anticipate that the backlog will soon reach 165,000. We have twenty-five different agencies that are involved in trying to enforce equal employment. And so we see that we have the mechanisms, but progress is slower than we would like.

If we look at higher education, and that's a topic that most of us are interested in here, we find the same kind of picture, that is, slow progress. We find that the proportion of female students seeking bachelor's degrees has remained about the same over the last ten- to twelve-year period. The rate is projected to go up slightly by about 1980 when approximately forty-seven percent of undergraduates will be women. As many of you know who follow these things, the increase is probably primarily due to older women who are returning to school. There is some progress in women in undergraduate education. However, if we look at the proportion of doctorates given to women, we find that that percentage is only about nine to thirteen percent, and has remained that for about the last 25 years. There may be some slight upturns in the past year or two, but, by and large, it's not progressing at the rate we'd like.

If we look at the faculty picture, we find that in 1974 and 1975, 22.5 percent of all faculty members were women. That actually dropped last year to 21.7 percent, probably not a significant drop, but, nonetheless, we're not making startling gains. If you look at where those women are employed, you find that they're employed in less prestigious institutions, the community colleges, the two-year colleges, and four-year colleges rather than the universities. And you find that they are at the lower ranks, and often in temporary appointments.

If we look at the administrative picture, we find that it's more discouraging, in some ways, because of the very few women who are in administration. The latest figure I read was that less than one-half of one percent of all the presidents of institutions in the country are women. We find that that percentage has decreased slightly in the last couple of years, because many of the women who were presidents were presidents of small Catholic institutions that have had financial difficulties and have closed.

So the picture overall doesn't look very encouraging if you just look at the raw statistics. But is it really as bad as I'm suggesting by those statistics? I honestly don't think so. And one of the things that I would like to say today is that I think that now is a time, in the course of the Women's Movement, when people may become discouraged. They may abandon their attempts because dramatic gains have not been made. But I think it's terribly important that we not abandon our goals, because I do think some seeds for some very important progress for the future have been sown.

When I talk with my male acquaintances in business—some of whom are heads of large institutions and businesses—they indicate to me a real commitment to hiring women. They're not going to bring in women, I think, at token levels at high positions, but they are working very hard to get women in lower positions in order to encourage them to come up through the ranks. I think that opportunities are ahead of us.

If we look at some of the reasons which might account for existing inequities which have existed between men and women, from salaries to promotion opportunities, I think there are a number of things that can account for those inequities, and I suspect all of you in this room can list those as readily as I can. The reasons range from things like the marriage and family role of women to geographical stability or immobility (which is a problem for many women, particularly in higher education), to lack of day-care centers, to scheduling difficulties; and I think many of us are aware of these factors and are working on them. I do not mean to suggest that we should stop working. I think some things have been talked about so much that it may get to be "old" to pursue them, such as the development of adequate day-care facilities, but we must continue the pursuit.

Many of the factors, however, are external to us as individuals, and what I'd like to talk about a little bit today are some of the changes which I feel that we as individual women can effect and can control for ourselves. Those have to do primarily with attitudes. I'm persuaded that one of the very important deterrents to women and to the progress of women is the attitude they have about themselves. Now some of you, I'm sure, are familiar with the literature on this, and if you look through it, you'll find a number of studies which report the stereotypes that both men and women hold about women. Broverman and some of his colleagues, for example, have done a very nice summary of the literature on this and have found that both men and women believe women to be less competent, less independent, less objective, and less logical than men. Men, on the other hand, are believed to be less warm, less expressive and to have less interpersonal sensitivity. And I can't help but remark in passing that men who are sensitive and have good interpersonal relationships have as much of a problem as women who are competent and logical, because we carry these stereotypes about the sexes and they do tend to limit us. I wasn't very surprised, and I'm sure you're not, in looking at the literature, to find that women feel that they are incompetent, and that they are judged by other people to be less competent than men.

But the study that I almost always talk about, because it's one which impressed me so much, is a study done by a man by the name of Basil at Stanford University. He was interested in the attitudes of women who were themselves employed at the middle management level. That is, they were successful; they had achieved according to their competence. They had been placed and were recognized in an organization. So he sent out an attitude survey to these women and to their male bosses and asked: What are the characteristics which are true for successful managers? He found, not very surprisingly, that both men and women — both these women who were employed as successful middle managers and their bosses — listed the same traits for successful managers. Furthermore, he found that they even rank-ordered them in the same way, so that there was almost universal agreement about managerial characteristics, certainly agreement between the sexes.

Then he asked which of these characteristics are true for women and which are true for men. Well, the thing most interesting to me is that the sexes both agreed again; that is, they selected the same characteristics as being

true for men managers as for women. The top four were characteristic of men and the bottom four were characteristic of women. And you might be interested in knowing what those were. The four top and valued characteristics which were true of men were: decisiveness, consistency and objectivity, emotional stability, and analytical ability. Here we have the same kind of picture again: tough-minded, rational, objective traits are characteristic. These are what it really takes. These are what's important. The characteristics which were also true, but less valued, for successful managers, were the characteristics of women: perception and empathy, loyalty, interest in people, and creativity. You see the propagation of the stereotypes.

I have found this study discouraging, because of all the groups that have been studied, these women, who were already successfully employed, should have been able to beat those stereotypes, and yet they're still there. It's that kind of thing which has persuaded me that women's attitudes about themselves probably do as much as anything else to limit the progress that's made. If you don't believe you can do it, you don't get started on the task.

So I want to talk today about six things that I think we as individuals can do in helping ourselves as individuals along a leadership path or an achieving path, six "C's" to help you remember them. I'll list them and then talk about each one: confidence, competence, credibility, contacts, charisma, and commitment.

As I thought about this, I debated about whether to place competence or confidence as the first; then I deliberately selected confidence as coming even before competence. That does not mean I don't think competence is important; I do, and I'm going to talk about that. But I think women so often lack confidence that they can do something that they don't start down the road to help achieve those competencies they will need. I think one of the things that may happen to young women as they approach the task of finding out what they're about, where they can go, is that initially they become unrealistically self-confident. They may try to convince themselves and the world that they can do anything. Then as they face the first problem, they tend to fold completely and to vacillate back and forth between that over-confidence and a feeling of complete rejection or sense of failure.

I can remember a young woman who came into my office, blurting and storming that she had been mistreated and that her abilities were not recognized. She felt that people were not appreciating her. And when we got down to it, it became evident that the real problem was her lack of confidence in herself, not really the lack of confidence of other people. So she had given the impression of having great over-confidence (that was what was reported to me by other people); but when we really got down to the nitty-gritty, it was her fear about herself that was the problem.

I can give you a very personal example of this. I sometimes have the opportunity to fly on our university plane, and I have been very desirous of learning to fly. It was with great confidence I felt I could. Flying was very easy to talk about as long as I didn't have to perform. The university pilot was kind and humored me (he knew that he should do that). He began to teach me a little bit and so whetted my appetite to learn this skill that I've now started pilot training. Well, I can tell you how important it is to have that confidence; it's the first skill I've really tried to attain from a zero knowledge base in a long time. It has forced me back to student status. I'll be glad when I develop enough confidence about what I'm doing to perform better. I see myself improving; I see the movements becoming

smoother because I'm gaining that confidence, and I'm willing to tackle things I wasn't when I first sat there with all those controls in front of me, not knowing what it was all about.

I think you can empathize with this yourself, and recognize that it is important to have confidence before you can begin to develop the skills that you need. So I'd like to suggest that the very first step is to believe in yourself. And one of the best ways in which you can do that is to set goals that are realistic. Don't try too much. Try enough, and then give yourself the reward of the accomplishment. Then set the next highest goal, and so forth. The other thing that I would like to suggest here is a point which has been made many times by many people, but it's one that I keep reiterating. That is, we can do a great deal to help one another as women to gain that confidence by supporting each other. The reason we don't support other women is the subject of another whole talk, and I won't tackle that today. But I would simply say that we must, and we can, give each other the kind of support to develop that confidence.

The second "C" is competence. I think the best thing I can suggest with regard to developing competence is a need for focus. I've known many young women who are ambitious, who want to accomplish something, but their goals are so diffused that they don't know where to start. We've heard a lot about "blind ambition" in the last couple of years. I think diffused ambition also has its limitations because it doesn't really allow one to get started on something. So, in developing those competencies, the most important thing is to focus on the goal you want to achieve, and to be very honest about that. I think women have had difficulty admitting, "I really want to do something — I really want to be a department chair — I really want to be a vice-president of an organization." They would rather sit back modestly and wait for somebody to come and seek them out instead of going after specific goals. Now, one can be very aggressive and obnoxious about it. I'm not recommending that, but I am saying to be honest with what you'd like to do, make it realistic, and then go about trying to develop the competencies you need.

While I was at Illinois State, I had the privilege of having two administrative interns serve with me in two successive years. It was a very good experience for me because it made me self-conscious about what I was doing in administration and how one goes about teaching it. That's a very difficult task. These young women both admitted, "I want to be an administrator. I want to seek these competencies which will make me skillful. Tell me how to do it." One of the things I used to suggest to them is that they try to analyze very specifically the competencies that were needed in order to reach the goal they wanted. If they needed budget-making skills, then they should seek training in that area. If they needed human relations skills, then they should try to develop those. Unfortunately, you can't sign up in a course and gain human relations skills quite as easily as you can obtain budget skills. But I suggested that they find out exactly what they were about and what they wanted to do.

Another thing I recommended to them is to find people who represent good and bad instances of whatever they wanted to be. Now, I'm very interested in administration, and I think you, as faculty members and staff people, realize that administrators are rather frequently singled out as being either good or bad. You don't just say, that's an administrator; you say, that's a bad administrator, or, less frequently, a good administrator. I hear such judgments very often, needless to say, and what I do is make it a point to ask, "Why? What are the characteristics?" One can learn a great deal about administration by finding out what other people value in it.

Then you can pick out models; you can find people who are models to copy and people who are models to avoid. I think that is one of the best ways in which you can gain the competencies that you seek.

Finally, I would say that once you have tried all this, you seek evaluations of your efforts. There is a quotation which I say to myself often since I've stumbled on it. I like it a great deal and I want to share it with you: "The trouble with most of us is that we would rather be ruined by praise than saved by criticism." I think that if we seek some of that constructive criticism we will go a long way toward developing our own competencies. Most importantly, when you develop these competencies, don't be modest about them. Don't wait for someone to come seek you out. I remember a friend of mine who moved to a new locale. She was an excellent librarian. There were a number of libraries in that city, but what she did was put together a rather self-effacive resumé and mail it. Needless to say, she didn't get called. One has to organize a better kind of campaign to let people know what one's abilities are. I think men have done a much better job, by and large, of writing resumés and managing to group together the skills that they have and to present them in a good way. Adequate presentation of one's abilities is a must.

To move on, another characteristic I think essential for getting ahead is credibility. To me, as an administrator, that may be one of the most important characteristics to successful administration. I think it's terribly important that no matter what role you're in, always play it straight. Don't attempt to be devious. How many people have you known in management, or in life, for that matter, who tried to get ahead by a devious approach? And how often has that backfired? I think one of the chief ways in which you can attain and maintain credibility is to be straightforward, not lie, not be devious, and not just tell people things they want to hear.

I think another way in which you can develop credibility, and this is particularly important for women, is not to talk until you really know what you're talking about. One of the stereotypes about women is that they talk a lot, that they talk superficially, and that they don't know what they're talking about. It's a stereotype, but it's a stereotype that you have to recognize is there and try to overcome. And so I think it's good advice to suggest not that you never speak, but that you wait until you are very familiar with the subject matter and can speak quietly and effectively.

I would suggest that other aspects of developing credibility are eliminating pettiness and avoiding personal attacks. It's very easy for us to try to get ahead in the world, both men and women, by belittling the other person, or even by rather subtly pointing out the other person's faults, problems, weaknesses, and by hinting about how much better we are. I don't think that's the road to follow. I don't think that's the way to maintain credibility. I would also like to suggest that another very important part of maintaining credibility is never to make promises you can't keep. Perhaps I'm talking to administrators as much as to anyone else, but that certainly is a temptation in administration. Almost everyone who comes to my office has a problem, or wants something. Many of these requests are very good requests, things I would love to do, love to be able to accomplish. You don't know how good it would make me feel if I could say to each and every person who walked in there, "Sure, we'll do that," and then find some excuse or some other person to dump the failure on. But I don't do that, and I think it's terribly important to one's credibility to let people know what you can and cannot do. If you make promises, keep them. On the other hand, if you make them and you achieve something, don't be overly modest about it. We go back to

that idea of finding a way by which you can successfully and inoffensively tell people what your accomplishments are.

The fourth thing I want to talk about is contacts. This is an area I've thought of developing into a separate talk, because I believe that women are less familiar than men are with the political organization of the institutions in which they work and it is very important to getting ahead to know the political organization, to have those contacts.

I remember a young woman, unlike the librarian I described, a young woman who was in another field. She had learned her lessons well. She wanted to get a job in a particular institution, so she made sure that she got appointed to a committee on which she had the opportunity to meet some people from the institution. She also developed a very good resumé and sent it to her friends. She also sent it to the department. Then she managed to be able to call that department on another matter altogether. She got her name before those people at least five or six times, in some fairly subtle and unconnected ways. That's one way to go about developing contacts, and it's a good way, I think. She was a competent person; she was selected for her competencies, but it wouldn't matter how competent she was if she were never known. I think that to get ahead you need to analyze who makes the decisions in an institution and how to affect those decisions.

I suggested to the interns whom I mentioned before that to develop competencies about administration, they pick out what each thought to be one of the most important functions of the institution. One of them selected curriculum and another one selected budget. Then I said, "Go through, in any way you want to, and determine the formal procedure by which decisions get made with regard to that function. For example, suppose you're a new faculty person, and you want to introduce a new course into the curriculum. What steps would you have to go through, and who's going to make the difference in that decision, according to the formal organization chart? Where will it go? How will it finally be determined?" They did that. Then they came back, and I said, "O.K., now go do the same thing in terms of the informal organization. Who really makes the decisions at each step of the way? And whom do you have to influence in order to reach your goal successfully?" That can be a very revealing kind of exercise. You can learn a great deal about your political organization if you do such an exercise for your department or your unit or your university. And I would recommend it as a brief and easy way in which to begin to develop some of these contacts in any other political organization.

Another characteristic which I was alittle reluctant to talk about for awhile because I know so little about it (I think very few people know very much about it) is that thing we call charisma. I think we can probably define charisma as a personal magic arousing loyalty (if magic is acceptable in a definition since it suggests that we don't know much about it). Think of somebody who has charisma. How many of you named a woman? [A few hands were raised.] I'm delighted, because other times when I've asked the question, no women were named. So I'm very pleased to see that there are some of you who will name a woman. I don't know how we pick out these people; I almost hesitate to make suggestions because the people that come to mind are political figures, and I'm not endorsing any particular person here. But I think many of us would think about John Kennedy as a person who had charisma. Some of you might think about Eleanor Roosevelt as an example of a woman who had charisma. But, by and large, we do not tend to think of women as having charisma, and that disturbs me, because I think charisma is something that we must develop if we're going to have leadership abilities and characteristics. I think one of the reasons that

women have not developed charisma is that they have not functioned very much as leaders, and charisma is a trait which comes about as a result of being a leader. Not all leaders develop it, but I think some leaders do, and I think that they often need leadership experiences in order to develop it. Well, women haven't looked to other women for leadership, and it's a surety that men haven't. So women have had limited opportunities to develop charisma through leadership.

I don't have a recipe on how to develop charisma. I'm still thinking about that one. But I do have some suggestions to make about leadership and about the kind of behavior which might elicit followership in other people. I often ask myself: Why should I lead this group of people? What am I doing for them? What am I doing that they can't achieve for themselves? Am I there simply because I hold a title in a formal organization, or am I there because I'm helping them to achieve some goals that are important to them and which they could not achieve without my help? I don't really know the answer to charisma, but I think such questions are the beginning of it. I think that if you ask yourself these questions, and if you have that kind of dedication, that is the beginning.

Finally, I'd like to talk about commitment, because if one really wants to achieve as a woman, whether to get the next degree, to take a course for one's personal satisfaction, or to attain a position of leadership, it's going to take commitment. The progress that we seek will not come without a willingness to give up some things that we want. I was very interested in talking with somebody here earlier today. She mentioned, "If I wanted an education, I knew I had to give up some things." And I think that's right. It's that kind of commitment which is necessary, and it has to be a kind of conscious, deliberate effort. I personally have had to make that commitment many times. I sometimes am concerned about that. I'm divorced, have two sons, one of them still lives with me, and he worries from time to time about how much commitment Mom has to her job and how much to him and about whether those are really choices. And we talk about it. Again, I don't have any real answers for you, but I am persuaded that one must make some decisions which are not always easy decisions, and then follow through on them. If you do have that kind of commitment, and that focus, then you are going to be able to achieve.

I'd like to conclude today by reading you a quotation from a book that I read fairly recently, called *Even Cowgirls Get the Blues*.[1] I don't know whether you've read the book or not. I'm not necessarily recommending it to everybody, but I thought the book said some interesting things. There's one passage that I particularly like, that I want to share with you in conclusion:

"They teach us to believe in Santa Claus, right? And the Easter Bunny. Wondrous critters, both of 'em. Then one day they tell us, 'Well, there really isn't any Santa Claus or Easter Bunny, it was Mama and Daddy all along.' So we feel a bit cheated, but we accept it because, after all, we got the goodies, no matter where they came from, and the Tooth Fairy never had much credibility to begin with. Okay. So they let you dress up like a cowgirl, and when you say, 'I'm gonna be a cowgirl when I grow up,' they laugh and say, 'Ain't she cute.' Then one day they tell you, 'Look, honey, cowgirls are only play. You can't *really* be one.' And that's when I holler, 'Wait a minute! Hold on! Santa and the Easter Bunny, I understand; they were nice lies and I don't blame you for them. But now you're [messing] around with my personal identity, with my plans for the future. What do you mean I can't be a cowgirl?'"[2]

---

[1] *From Even Cowgirls Get the Blues by Tom Robbins. Copyright © 1976 by Thomas Robbins. Reprinted by permission of Houghton-Mifflin.*

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 148.

And later, she says,

"...I'm a cowgirl. I've always been a cowgirl...Now I'm in a position where I can help others become cowgirls, too. If a child wants to grow up to be a cowgirl, she ought to be able to do it, or else this world ain't worth living in. I want every little girl — and every boy, for that matter — to be free to realize their fantasies. Anything less than that is unacceptable to me."[3]

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

Notes on Contributors

Alexander W. Astin has been professor of higher education at the University of California, Los Angeles, since 1973. He is director of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, which is conducted jointly by UCLA and the American Council on Education. Dr. Astin is also president of the Higher Education Research Institute in Los Angeles.

Patricia G. Ball is an assistant professor in educational psychology at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. Dr. Ball is currently directing a Women's Educational Equity Act project entitled "Appalachian Center for Educational Equity."

Constance M. Carroll is assistant dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Maine at Portland-Gorham. She has served as a member of the Chancellor's Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities at the University of Pittsburg and has recently been appointed co-chairperson of the Higher Education Commission of the National Council of Negro Women.

Marjorie Bell Chambers is the former president of Colorado Women's College at Denver and is a presidential appointee to the Advisory Council for Women's Educational Programs. Currently, she is the president of the American Association of University Women.

R. Susan Gordon was the assistant director of the department of workshops and non-credit programs at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. Currently, she is the deputy director of the Commission on the Status of Women for the State of Tennessee.

Geraldine E. Hammond has been a professor of English at Wichita State University for the past 46 years. She was the presidentially appointed chair for the Wichita State University Commission on Human Relations in 1973 whose primary charge was to set up an official affirmative action program for the university. She is also the administrative liaison coordinator for Project DELTA.

Carolyn G. Heilbrun is professor of English at Columbia University. One of her critical interests is the re-evaluation of women's role as depicted in literature throughout the ages.

Rosabeth Moss Kanter is professor of sociology at Yale and a visiting scholar at Harvard Law School. She has taught at Brandeis and is a consultant to business, industry, and government.

Marion Kilson is an associate professor of sociology at Simmons College in Boston. Dr. Kilson was a National Endowment for the Humanities Younger Scholar fellow and scholar at the Radcliffe Institute from 1968 to 1970.

Sally L. Kitch is an assistant professor of women's studies at Wichita State University. She is also the development coordinator of Project DELTA, and the Midwest regional coordinator of the National Women's Studies Association.

Carol Wolfe Konek is an assistant professor of English and women's studies at Wichita State University. Dr. Konek has been the project director of Project DELTA since the grant was funded in 1976.

Adrienne Rich is a poet and professor of English at Douglass College, Rutgers University. Her first book won the Yale Younger Poets Award and she has received two Guggenheim Fellowship awards.

Herbert A. Shepard has been a consultant for industrial, educational, governmental, and health organizations. His initiation of experiments in organization development at Esso are well-known, as is his founding of the Case Western Reserve University doctoral program in organization development.

Thomas M. Stauffer is the director of the American Council on Education Fellows Program in Academic Administration and Related Programs in Washington. Dr. Stauffer is a well-known consultant for many government agencies, universities, and professional associations.

Annette TenElshof is currently dean of students at Tulane University. During her tenure at Wichita State University, she was instrumental in the planning of the Project DELTA grant. Dr. TenElshof teaches in the area of higher education.

Sheila Tobias is an associate provost at Wesleyan University and a codirector (with Robert Rosenbaum) at Wesleyan of the Math Anxiety Clinic founded by them in 1975 with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Barbara Uehling is presently serving as provost for the University of Oklahoma and has recently been named chancellor of the University of Missouri at Columbia. She is serving as president of the American Association for Higher Education and has been named to the Board of Directors for the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Marjorie Downing Wagner is the vice-chancellor of Faculty and Staff Affairs of the California State University and Colleges System. She is also a member of the American Council on Education Commission on Leadership Development. Prior to her appointment as vice-chancellor, Dr. Wagner was president of Sonoma State College, California.

Selected Bibliography*

Abramson, Joan: *The Invisible Woman* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers), 1975.

Alberti, Robert E. and Emmons, Michael L.: *Stand Up, Speak Out, Talk Back* (New York: Pocket Books), 1975.

A Nation of Learners (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402), 1976.

Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, Committee on the Status of Women in the Professions), April 1971.

Argyris, Chris: *Increasing Leadership Effectiveness* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1976.

Ashburn, Elizabeth A.: *Motivation, Personality, and Work-Related Characteristics of Women in Male-Dominated Professions* (Monograph published by NAWDAC, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 922, Washington, D.C. 20036), March 1977.

Astin, Helen S. and Bayer, Alan E.: "Progress in the Elimination of Sex Discrimination in Academe: Have Antibias Regulations and 'Good Faith' Helped?" pp. 796-802 in *Science*, May 1975, 188.

Astin, Helen, Suniewick, Nancy, and Dweck, Susan: *The Woman Doctorate in America: Origins, Careers and Family* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation), 1969.

Astin, Helen, Suniewick, Nancy, and Dweck, Susan: *Women: A Bibliography of Their Education and Careers* (Washington, D.C.: Human Service Press), 1971.

Baker, Liva: *I'm Radcliffe, Fly Me: The Seven Sisters and the Failure of Women's Education* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.), 1976.

Baldridge, J.V.: *Academic Governance* (Berkeley, California: McCutchan), 1971.

Bass, Bernard: *Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers), 1960.

Bennis, Warren G. and Schein, Edgar H., eds.: *Leadership and Motivation: Essays of Douglas McGregor* (Cambridge: MIT Press), 1966.

Bennis, Warren G., Benne, K., and Chin, R., eds.: *The Planning of Change* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston), 1969.

Bereaud, Susan: *Women in Education: A Bibliography* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University), 1971.

Bernard, Jessie: *Academic Women* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press), 1964.

Berry, Jane and Kushner, Richard: "A Critical Look at the Queen Bee Syndrome," pp. 173-76 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Summer 1975.

Bird, Caroline: *Enterprising Women* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.), 1976.

Blau, Peter: *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1964.

Blau, Peter: *Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure* (New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.), 1977.

Blaxall, Martha and Reagan, Barbara: *Women and the Workplace: The Implications of Occupational Segregation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1976.

Brackett, Anna Callender, ed.: *Women and the Higher Education, New York, 1893*. Reprinted by (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press), 1971.

Brown, David G.: *The Mobile Professors* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education), 1967.

Brownlee, W. Elliot and Brownlee, Mary M.: *Women in the American Economy: A Documentary History, 1675 to 1929* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press), 1976.

Bruemmer, Linda: "The Condition of Women in Society Today: An Annotated Bibliography, Part II," pp. 89-95 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Winter 1970, 33.

Buskirk, Richard H.: *Your Career: How to Plan It, Manage It, Change It* (New York: New American Library), 1976.

Carver, Fred D. and Sergiovanni, Thomas J., eds.: *Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1969.

Chare, William H.: *Women and Equality: Changing Patterns in American Culture* (New York: Oxford Press), 1976.

Cohen, Audrey C.: "Women and Higher Education: Recommendations for Change," pp. 164-67 in *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 1971, 53.

"College Presidents React to AAUW Guidelines on Equality," *AAUW Journal*, January 1972.

Crain, Sharie: *Taking Stock: A Woman's Guide to Corporate Success* (Chicago: Contemporary Books), 1977.

Davis, Ann E.: "Women as a Minority Group in Higher Academics," pp. 95-99 in *The American Sociologist*, May 1969.

Dejong, Peter: *Patterns of Intergenerational Occupational Mobility of American Females* (Palo Alto, Ca.: R & E Research Associates), 1977.

Dyer, Wayne W.: *Your Erroneous Zones* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls), 1976.

*To avoid duplication, if books or articles have been listed elsewhere in the manual, they are not listed in this section.

Eiden, Leo J.: "Trends in Female Degree Recipients," *American Education*, November 1976, 12.

Epstein, Cynthia: *Bringing Women into Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1975.

Equal Rights for Women in Education: A Resource Handbook for Policy Makers, Report Number 77, from the Equal Rights for Women in Education Project (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States), January 1976.

Farmer, Helen S.: *New Career Options for Women: A Counselor's Sourcebook* (AERA) (Human Sciences Press), 1977.

Fishel, Andrew and Pottker, Janice: "Performance of Women Principals: Review of Behavioral and Attitudinal Studies," pp. 110-17 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Spring 1975.

Fishel, Andrew and Pottker, Janice: "Women in Educational Governance: A Statistical Portrait," pp. 4-7 in *Educational Researcher*, 1974, 3.

Fishel, Andrew and Pottker, Janice: "Women Lose Out: Is There Sex Discrimination in School Administration?" pp. 387-91 in *Clearing House*, 1973, 47.

Fisher, Margaret B. and Smith, Margaret Ruth: *Writing as a Professional Activity* (Monograph published by NAWDAC, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 922, Washington, D.C. 20036), March 1976.

Flexner, Eleanor: *A Century of Struggle* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 1959.

Freeman, Jo: *Women: A Feminist Perspective* (Palo Alto, Ca.: Mayfield Publishers), 1975.

Fuller, F. and Batchelder, M.: "Opposition for Women at the Administrative Level," pp. 111-28 in *Harvard Business Review*, 1953, 31.

Furniss, W. Todd and Graham, Patricia Albjerg, eds.: *Women in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education), 1974.

Garrard, Meg: *Women in Management: Proceedings of the Conference - Women and Men, Colleagues in Management* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press), 1976.

Garson, Helen S.: "Hurry Up Please, It's Time," pp. 168-72 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Summer 1975.

Ginzberg, Eli: *Life Styles of Educated Women* (New York: Columbia University Press), 1966.

Ginzberg, Eli and Yohalem, Alice M., eds.: *Corporate Lib: Women's Challenge to Management* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press), 1973.

Ginzberg, Eli and Yohalem, Alice M.: *Educated American Women: Self-Portraits* (New York: Columbia University Press), 1966.

Goerss, Katherine VanWessem: *Women Administrators in Education: A Review of Research, 1960-1976* (Monograph published by NAWDAC, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 922, Washington, D.C. 20036), July 1977.

Goodman, Natalie: *Women and Management* (Cambridge, MA: Radcliffe Institute), 1976.

Green, E. et al.: *Discrimination Against Women*. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Part II. (Washington, D.C.: GPO), 1971.

Harmon, Linda A., compiler: *Status of Women in Higher Education, 1963-1972: A Selective Bibliography*. Series in Bibliography, Number 2. (Ames, Iowa: State University Library), 1972.

Hart, Donna: "Enlarging the American Dream," *American Education*, May 1977, 13.

Havelock, Ronald G. and Havelock, Mary C.: *Training for Change Agents: A Guide to the Design of Training Programs in Education and Other Fields* (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan), 1973.

Hemphill, J., Griffiths, D., and Frederickson, H.: *Administrative Performance and Personality* (New York: Teachers College Press), 1962.

Higginson, Margaret V. and Quick, Thomas L.: *The Woman's Guide to a Successful Career* (New York: Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, Publishers), 1975.

Homans, George C.: *The Human Group* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.), 1950.

Horner, Matina: "Fail: Bright Women," *Psychology Today*, November 1969.

Horner, Matina: "Toward an Understanding of Achievement-Related Conflicts in Women," pp. 157-175 in *Journal of Social Issues*, 1972, 28.

Howard, Suzanne: *Why Aren't Women Administering Our Schools? The Status of Women Public School Teachers and the Factors Hindering Their Promotion into Administration* (Washington, D.C.: National Council of Administrative Women in Education), 1975.

Howe, Florence: "Educating Women: A Revolutionary Perspective," *Saturday Review*, October 16, 1971.

Howe, Florence: "The Education of Women," *Liberation*, August-September 1969.

Hughes, Helen MacGill: "Maid of All Work or Departmental Sister-in-Law? The Faculty Wife Employed on Campus," pp. 767-72 in *American Journal of Sociology*, January 1973, 73.

Husbands, Sandra Acker: "Women's Place in Higher Education?" pp. 261-74 in *School Review*, February 1972, 80.

Jakubowski-Spector, Patricia: *An Introduction to Assertiveness Training Procedures for Women* (Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association), 1973.

Jakubowski-Spector, Patricia: "Facilitating the Growth of Women Through Assertive Training," p. 76 in *Counseling Psychologist*, 1973, 4.

Kadzielski, Mark A.: "Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972: Change or Continuity?" pp. 183-203 in *Journal of Law and Education*, April 1977, 6.

Kane, Roslyn D.: *Sex Discrimination in Education: A Study of Employment Practices Affecting Professional Personnel* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), April 1976.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn Robert L.: *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.), 1966.

Kaufman, Roger: *Identifying and Solving Problems: A System Approach* (La Jolla, Cal.: University Associates, Inc.) 1976.

Khosh, Mary N.: *A Career-Planning Program for Women: The Experience Cue* (Monograph published by NAWDAC, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 922, Washington, D.C. 20036), December 1977.

Knox, Barbara S.: *Trends in Counseling Women in Higher Education, 1957-73* (Monograph published by NAWDAC, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 922, Washington, D.C. 20036), July 1975.

Lange, Arthur J. and Jakubowski, Patricia: *Responsible Assertive Behavior* (Champaign, Illinois: Research Press), 1976.

La Nove, George R.: "The Future of Antidiscrimination Enforcement," p. 44 in *Change*, June 1974, 6.

LaPiere, Richard T.: *Social Change* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1965.

Lewis, Edwin C.: *Developing Woman's Potential* (Ames: Iowa State University Press), 1968.

Lewis, Edwin C.: "The Second Sex in Academe," *AAUP Bulletin*, March 1971, 57.

Likert, Rensis: *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1967.

Likert, Rensis: *New Patterns of Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1961.

Lippitt, Gordon: *Visualizing Change: Model Building and the Change Process* (La Jolla, Cal.: University Associates, Inc.), 1973.

Loeb, J. and Ferber, M.: "Sex as Predictive of Salary and Status on a University Faculty," pp. 235-244 in *Journal of Educational Measurements*, Winter 1971, 8.

Lopate, Carol: *Women in Medicine* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press), 1968.

Maccoby, Eleanor, ed.: *The Development of Sex Differences* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press), 1966.

Marcus, Laurence R.: "The Factors Affecting Successful Implementation of Affirmative Action," pp. 3-5, 18-19 in *Equal Opportunity Forum*, January 1977, 4.

Marrow, Foster: "Preparation of Administrators," pp. 8-14 in *Educational Digest*, November 1974.

Maslow, Abraham H.: *Eupsychian Management: A Journal* (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. and The Dorsey Press), 1965.

McBee, M. Louise: "A New Day," pp. 184-187 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Summer 1975.

McCune, Shirley and Mathews, Martha: *Programs for Educational Equity: Schools and Affirmative Action* (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20204), 1975.

McGrath, Patricia: *The Unfinished Assignment: Equal Education for Women* (Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau), 1976.

McGregor, D.: *The Human Side of Enterprise* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1960.

Mednick, M.T.S., Tangri, S.S., and Hoffman, L.W.: *Women and Achievement: Social and Motivational Analyses* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan), 1975.

Miller, Casey and Swift, Kate: *Words and Women: New Language in New Times* (Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday), 1976.

Millet, Kate: *Token Learning* (Report from the Education Committee of the New York Chapter of the National Organization of Women), 1969.

Millman, Marcia and Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, eds.: *Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science* (Garden City: Anchor Press/Doubleday), 1975.

Minority Women's Organizations: A Partial Annotated List (Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009), October 1977.

Newcomer, Mabel: *A Century of Higher Education for American Women* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers), 1959.

Nieboer, Nancy A.: "There Is a Certain Kind of Woman..." pp. 99-103 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Spring 1975.

On Campus with Women (Project of the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009), March 1978.

Palmieri, Patricia and Shakeshaft, Carol Smith: "Up the Front Staircase: A Proposal for Women to Achieve Parity with Men in the Field of Educational Administration," *Journal of NAWDAC*, Winter 1976, 39.

Park, Dabney: "Down with Tenure," pp. 32-37 in *Change*, March 1972, 4.

Partnow, Elaine, editor and compiler: *The Quotable Woman: 1800-1975* (Los Angeles: Corwin Books), 1977.

Perkins, Lisa H.: "Response to Edwin Lewis' Article 'The Second Sex in Academe,'" *AAUP Bulletin*, March 1971, 57.

Perkins, Lisa H.: *The University as an Organization* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1973.

Peterson, Martha: "Women Administrator Speaks: Openness and Secrecy in Educational Administration," pp. 124-31 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Spring 1975.

Pfeiffer, J. William and Jones, John: *A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training, Vol. 1.* (Iowa City, Iowa: University Associates Press), 1970.

Pogrebin, Letty Cottin: *Getting Yours: How to Make the System Work for the Working Woman* (New York: Avon Books), 1975.

Pullen, Doris: "The Educational Establishment: Wasted Women," in *Voices of the New Feminism*, Thompson, Mary, ed. (Boston: Beacon Press), 1970.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R.N.: *Dual-Career Families* (Middlesex, England: Penguin), 1971.

Rawlings, Edna I. and Carter, Dianne, K., eds.: *Psychotherapy for Women* (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas), 1977.

Recruiting Women for Traditionally "Male" Careers: Programs and Resources for Getting Women into the Men's World (Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009), October 1977.

Rennie, Susan and Grimstad, Kirsten, eds.: *The New Woman's Survival Sourcebook* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.), 1975.

Roesch, Roberta: *There's Always a Right Job for Every Woman* (New York: Berkley Publishing Corp.), 1976.

Ross, Susan C., ed.: *American Civil Liberties Union Handbook* (New York: Avon Books), 1973.

Rossi, Alice: "Discrimination and Demography Restrict Opportunities for Academic Women," p. 78 in *College and University Business*, February 1970.

Rossi, Alice: "Job Discrimination and What Women Can Do About It," pp. 99-102 in *The Atlantic*, 1970, 225 (3).

Rossi, Alice and Calderwood, Anne, eds.: *Academic Women on the Move* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation), 1973.

Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty, 1975-76, NCES 72-117 (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, Washington, D.C. 20202), January 27, 1976.

Sandmeyer, Louise, Kohn, Patricia, Driscoll, Jeanne Baker, Harrison, Charlene H., and Sagaria, Mary Ann Danowitz: *A Program for Optimizing Women's Leadership Skills* (OWLS) (Monograph published by NAWDAC, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 922, Washington, D.C. 20036), December 1977.

Sassower, Doris L.: "The Legal Rights of Professional Women," pp. 205-208 in *Contemporary Education*, February 1972, Vol. 43.

Schein, E.: *Process Consultation: Its Role in Organizational Development* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.), 1969.

Schein, Virginia: "Relationships between Sex-Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics among Female Managers," pp. 340-344 in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, June 1975.

Schmeller, Kurt: "Collective Bargaining and Women in Higher Education," p. 34 in *College and University Journal*, May 1973.

Schwartz, Felice N., Schifter, Margaret H., and Gillotti, Susan S.: *How to Go to Work When Your Husband Is against It, Your Children Aren't Old Enough, and There's Nothing You Can Do Anyhow* (New York: Simon and Schuster), 1972.

Scott, Ann: "The Half-Eaten Apple: A look at Sex Discrimination in the University," *Reporter*, May 14, 1970.

Sexton, Patricia: *Women in Education* (Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation), 1976.

Simpson, Catherine R., ed.: *Discrimination against Women* (Bowter/CIS Congressional Document Series, edited in conjunction with the Congressional Information Service, Washington, D.C.) (New York: A Xerox Education Co.), 1973.

Smith, Manuel J.: *When I Say No, I Feel Guilty* (New York: Bantam Books, Inc.), 1975.

Staines, G., Tauris, C., and Jayarante, T.E.: "The Queen Bee Syndrome," pp. 55-60 in *Psychology Today*, January 1974, 7 (8).

Stent, Angela: "The Women's Bid for a Rhodes," pp. 13-16 in *Change*, June 1974, Vol. 6, No. 5.

Stoll, C.: *Female and Male: Socialization, Social Roles and Social Structure* (New York: Brown), 1974.

Summary of Federal Policy Concerning Twenty-Five Affirmative Action Issues in Employment (Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009).

Tannenbaum, Robert, et al.: *Leadership and Organizations* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.), 1961.

Tavris, Carol and Offir, Carole: *The Longest War* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.), 1977.

Taylor, Emily and Shavlick, Donna: "Selecting Professionals in Higher Education: A Title IX Perspective" (Order from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20422, stock #017-080-0178-3).

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and Women on Campus (Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009).

The Myth and the Reality (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C. 20210), May 1974 (revised).

Theodore, Athena: *The Professional Woman* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc.), 1971.

Tibbetts, Sylvia-Lee: "Sex-Role Stereotyping: Why Women Discriminate Against Themselves," pp. 177-183 in *Journal of NAWDAC*, Summer 1975.

Tobias, Sheila: "Put a Woman into My Department?" pp. 86-91 in *Journal College and University Personnel Association*, May 1971, 22.

Tobias, Sheila: "The Study of Women," pp. 1295-1301 in *Choice*, December 1971, Vol. 8.

Tobias, Sheila: "Teaching Female Studies: Looking Back over Three Years," pp. 258-64 in *Liberal Education*, May 1972, 58.

Tobias, Sheila, Kusnetz, E., and Spitz, D., eds.: *Proceedings of the Cornell Conference on Women, January 22-25, 1969* (Pittsburg, Pa.: KNOW, Inc.).

Twenty Facts on Women Workers (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C. 20210), June 1974.

Unger, Rhoda Kesler and Denmark, Florence L.: *Women: Dependent or Independent Variable?* (New York: Psychological Dimensions, Inc.).

VanAlstyne, Carol, Mensel, Frank R., Withers, Julie S., and Malott, Stephen F.: *Administrative Compensation Survey - Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions* (Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association), June 1977.

Verheyden-Hilliard, Mary Ellen: *A Handbook for Workshops of Sex Equality in Education: Information Activities Resources for Educators, Students, and the Community* (Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1607 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., 20009).

Warren, Roland L.: *Social Change and Human Purpose: Toward Understanding and Action* (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company), 1977.

Watson, Barbara Bellow, ed.: *Women's Studies: The Social Realities* (New York: Harper's College Press, a department of Harper & Row, Publishers), 1976.

Weisstein, Naomi: "Kinde, Kuch, Kirche as Scientific Law: Psychology Constructs the Female," *Motives*, 1969, 29.

West, Naida: *Leadership with a Feminine Cast* (San Francisco, CA: R & E Research Associates), 1976.

What You Should Know About Women (U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Women's Bureau, Washington, D.C. 20210), 1978.

White, Lynn: *Educating Our Daughters* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers), 1949.

Wilson, Pauline Park: *College Women Who Express Futility* (New York: AMS Press), 1972.

Wolfe, Dael and McCarthy, Joseph L.: "Doctorates Granted to Women and Minority Group Members," pp. 856-59 in *Science*, September 1975, 189.